BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE PRE-LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE KERYGMA

by

Donald Joseph Selby

(A.B., William Jewell College, 1946;
B.D., Andover Newton Theological School, 1949)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1954

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
725 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE
BOSTON 15, MASSACHUSETTS

April 13, 1954

University Microfilms
313 N. First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dear Sirs,

This is to certify that the dissertation, "The Pre-Literary Development of the Kerygma," by Donald Joseph Selby and the accompanying Abstract have been approved as ready for publication.

Donald T. Rowlingson
Major Professor

Elmer A. Leslie
Chairman of the Examining Committee

Duncan E. Macdonald
Dean of the Graduate School (R)

Approved
by

First Reader Donald T. Rowlingson
Professor of New Testament Literature

Second Reader Edwin P. Booth
Professor of Historical Theology

PREFACE

The larger problem within which the problem of this study is set has to do with the question of authority in matters of Christian doctrine and practice. This latter problem in its modern context may be described as the problem of continuity. If Christianity is to maintain itself as an historical religion, what is the relationship that properly obtains between its present-day expression and its historical roots?

The question for current Protestantism is particularly acute because, following the great reformers, it has always elevated the Bible above ecclesiastical authority as a source of Christian thought. The dogma of the inspiration of the Scriptures, which presupposed a closed canon, left the theologian with the comparatively simple task of ascertaining the facts of Scripture and of arranging them into a coherent system.

With the coming of higher criticism, the very foundations of this method have been in large measure removed. The primary documents of Christianity have come now to be treated as historical documents rather than dogmatic sources of Christian belief. Furthermore, the once presupposed unity of the Bible has vanished before the scrutiny of critical exegesis and in its place are varying ideas, sometimes appar-

ently unrelated, but in any case representing several schools of thought.[1]

The theologian, in consequence, finds it difficult to appeal to the New Testament, even on the basis of its authority as the historical background of modern Christianity, without being embarrassed by its variety of ideas. A part, therefore, of the problem of the authority of the Bible is manifest in the problems of its unity and its relation to Christian origins.

The prominence of this latter problem in current religious thought is indicated by a number of writings dealing with it. Of particular significance is the publication of the first major work of the Study Department of the World Council of Churches, under the title of Biblical Authority for Today.[2] While it leaves many important questions unanswered and makes tacit metaphysical assumptions which require clarification,[3] it has indicated the direction in which modern research should proceed. The symposium is united in its Christo-centric approach to Biblical interpretation and authority. That Christianity, in order to maintain its distinctive character, must find not only its historical origins but its vital center as well in its experience of Jesus

---

1. See Scott, VNR.

2. Richardson and Schweitzer (eds.), BAT.

3. Wilder, Rev. (1952), p. 183.

Christ is assumed in the very nature of the case. The Bible, then, derives its authority from its testimony to the character and meaning of the advent of Christ.

The question quite naturally follows: How is this testimony to be organized so as to present a coherent body of material from which Christian thinking may proceed? The question of perspective for interpreting the Bible, and the New Testament in particular, is basic for modern Christianity.

G. Ernest Wright, in a very suggestive paper presented before the National Association of Biblical Instructors at its December, 1951, meeting,[1] has attempted a solution of the problem of unity in terms of God's redemptive activity in the world. Starting with the definition of Biblical Theology as "the confessional recital of the Acts of God in a particular history, together with the inferences to be drawn from them",[2] he finds the unity of the Bible--both Old and New Testaments--in its interest in history as the source of the knowledge of God Who is known by His activity in history. The conclusion which he reaches will help to indicate the place of this study within the larger problem of the relation of the Bible to modern Christianity:

> What kind of unity does this conception give to the Bible? It is certainly not a static

---

1. Wright, Art. (1952).

2. Wright, Art. (1952), p. 195. (Italics his.)

> unity of all parts or of the ideas within the parts. Its is a unity which holds within it, and which provides for, a great amount of variety. The primary unity lies in the kerygmatic core of the Bible, whereas the concentration upon history and the problem of life within history is the occasion for great variety in conception, presentation, and particular interest.[1]

Of more direct importance to the specific problem with which this study is concerned is the study made of apostolic preaching by C. H. Dodd.[2] This work will come up for more detailed examination later. It is important in this connection to note two things about the book: 1. It has established the word kerygma as a technical term for a distinct branch of New Testament study and has focused the interest of critical scholarship upon its possibilities; 2. It has suggested the kerygma as a perspective for viewing the New Testament as a unity.

One other approach to New Testament studies must be mentioned here--that of Form Criticism. Its particular interest in this connection is the place it gives to the kerygma in the formation of gospel tradition. Martin Dibelius, one of the pioneers in this type of research, speaks of "preaching as the original seat of all tradition about

---

1. Wright, Art. (1952), pp. 196-97.

2. Dodd, AP.

Jesus".[1] A. M. Hunter, in commenting on this quotation, questions the word "all" but adds that "there is substantial truth in the contention . . . that . . . 'in the beginning was the kerygma'".[2]

The point of all this is that it indicates the importance of the kerygma as a subject of critical study in the context of the larger question of the relation of the Bible to modern Christianity. The reason for selecting the kerygma for this purpose may be summarized as follows: 1. It was historically prior to and presupposed by other materials in the New Testament; 2. It provides natural limits which allow it to be more easily controlled than the New Testament as a whole as an isolated study in the matter of early Christian ideas; 3. It permits an attempt to understand Christianity by means of its appeal to non-Christians. This last point assumes that what is most essential and most distinctive would naturally come to expression in such an appeal. Paul not infrequently in his teaching argues explicitly from the kerygma by which his churches were established.

Donald T. Rowlingson has raised the question, particularly with reference to the kerygma as formulated by Dodd, whether it is in fact as stereotyped and constant as has been

---

1. Dibelius, FTG, p. 14. Cited by Hunter, MNT, p. 26.

2. Hunter, MNT, p. 26.

assumed in recent discussions.[1] This question bears on the whole matter of the history of the kerygma itself as well as on its contents.

---

1. From a comment written on a term paper submitted by the writer for Dr. Rowlingson's course in Hebrews at Boston University, Fall semester, 1952.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CHARTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to attempt to retrace the history of the development of the New Testament kerygma and to indicate insofar as possible the nature of its contents. The word, kerygma, in this investigation is understood to mean the message which was preached by the early Christians to non-believers with a view to persuading them to accept the Christian Way. The study will first examine the New Testament evidence to see what account can be given of the kerygma at that level. It will then attempt to discover the inner logic by which the development can be retraced which resulted in the forms of the kerygma found in the New Testament.

2. Scope and Limitations

The present investigation, therefore, will be confined to the kerygma itself rather than to the second question of its relationship to and connections with the rest of the New Testament. The questions of the origin, development, unity and variety, nature and content of the kerygma are obviously prior to any question of its part in the developing literature of the New Testament or its use as a perspective for

interpreting the latter. The investigation for that reason will be concerned only with those passages from which, either directly or indirectly, something can be learned of the nature, history, and content of the primitive Christian appeal to non-believers.

3. Method

The method will be to draw inferences from the manifestations of the *kerygma* as they stand in the New Testament literature as to what must have been their pre-history. The study will begin with a detailed, statistical analysis of all passages in the New Testament which give any definite indication of *kerygma* content. After a survey of the historical value of these passages, the study will proceed to an examination of those items which by their prominence in the statistical analysis are indicated to be of central concern.

It will not be assumed that the *kerygma* was everywhere and always the same. Therefore, its content cannot be arrived at by means of an accumulative total. Variations in the evidence may very well indicate actual differences among the apostolic preachers. But it will be assumed that the points at which the various examples of the *kerygma* show the greatest overlapping are the points which indicate the center of interest and, quite possibly, the oldest strata of the tradition. These points of overlapping will form the start-

ing place for a reconstruction of the development of the *kerygma*.

The method of reconstruction will make use of the tools of literary and historical criticism insofar as they are applicable. In the course of the study, the dissimilarities and variations will be as significant as the points of overlapping in the search for the reasons for and the directions of the development of the *kerygma*. The comparison of the dissimilarities with the overlapping will be of value in attempting to reconstruct the problems and circumstances within which the message came into being. It is hoped that by such an approach a better understanding may be had of the meaning that Jesus held for the apostolic Church.

4. Previous Investigations of the Kerygma

Undoubtedly the study of the *kerygma* as a specific problem in New Testament research is an outgrowth of the development of Form Criticism. The interest of the latter in reconstructing the pre-literary growth of the Synoptic pericopae by means of an understanding of the life and activities of the primitive Church inevitably brought up the question of apostolic preaching.

Martin Dibelius, one of the pioneers in Form Criticism, attempted a formulation of the *kerygma* in a chapter entitled

"The Sermon".[1] His interest in this subject was to establish a perspective for his "constructive" method. For that reason he took no interest in the inner logic of the *kerygma*, nor did he attempt to describe its pre-literary history. The evidence upon which he drew for establishing the nature of apostolic preaching was taken mainly from the speeches in Acts and formulae such as those occurring in Romans 1 and I Corinthians 15. His treatment made no claim to be exhaustive or comprehensive.

The attention of New Testament scholarship was called to the *kerygma* as a field for independent study by C. H. Dodd in a series of lectures delivered at Kings College, University of London, in 1935, which were later published (1936), together with a paper read as a presidential address to the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, also in 1935, under the title, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. This work was issued in a second edition (1944), but with no change in content.

To a considerable degree, the basic method and conclusion of Dodd's study coincide with those of Dibelius, although Dodd in his book acknowledges no indebtedness to him.[2] The "development" which Dodd outlines is that which is discoverable within the New Testament documents themselves.

---

1. FTG, Ch. II.

2. The writer is indebted to Henry J. Cadbury for calling his attention to this fact in a personal note.

In fact, in seeking to delineate this development, he departs from the specifically *kerygma* material and analyzes the general development of the thought of the writers of the New Testament significant to his subject.

The clue to understanding the nature and development of the *kerygma* Dodd finds in the "eschatological setting" in which the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus are placed.[1] The formula-like pattern he thus discovers is deemed to be coeval with the Church, principally on the basis of the assumption that the speeches in Acts "are based upon a reminiscence of what the apostle actually said".[2] Since this book consists of three lectures reproduced "substantially as delivered, with only a minimum of revision", it makes no pretense of being an exhaustive treatment of the New Testament evidence of the *kerygma*.[3]

Several other books and articles ha[illegible]en written in which attention has been given to the *kerygma*. But inasmuch as none of them either question or seek to go back of Dodd's hypothesis, but rather assume it to be substantially correct, they are not, properly speaking, investigations of the *kerygma* and therefore do not merit mention here.

---

1. AP, p. 13.
2. AP, pp. 18-19.
3. AP, p. 5.

The undertaking of a new study of the _kerygma_ seems to be warranted for the following reasons: 1. No study of the subject has thus far been attempted by means of an analysis of all the references to it in the New Testament which can provide any relevant information. 2. The confidence in the reliability of the speeches in Acts for which Dodd argues is by no means shared by all New Testament scholars.[1] This leaves open the question as to the nature of the _kerygma_ in the pre-literary period. 3. There is no adequate attempt to explain the reasons why the _kerygma_ developed as it did into the forms found in the New Testament.

This study, as has already been indicated, will attempt to embrace all of the New Testament evidence that can safely be regarded as relevant and informative. The development with which this dissertation is concerned is that which is believed to have taken place in the first, pre-literary period of the Church's life, and it is believed that this can be tentatively reconstructed by an understanding of the motives and inner logic of the _kerygma_. The argument herein may be considered to be, in part, a criticism of Dodd's work by means of a different approach to the problem.

---

1. AP, pp. 17-20. See below, pp. 8, 18.

CHAPTER II.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE FOR KERYGMA CONTENT

Three kinds of evidence for the content of the kerygma will be considered in this study. The first of these is comprised of the direct accounts of such preaching provided by the speeches in Acts and similar formulae that make explicit or implicit claim to being such. The second consists of indirect references which contain some allusion to the content of the kerygma. In some cases these are from the editorial material in Acts or sayings assigned to other persons about the apostles' preaching. In the majority of cases, however, these references are found in the Pauline writings and come quite incidentally in the course of his argument as allusions to the preaching by which he had evangelized his addressees. The third type of evidence is the content of the Gospels, particularly the Synoptics, which, it is assumed, following the Form Critics,[1] is in large measure made up of material used in apostolic preaching.

1. Comparative Value of the Three Types of Evidence

It will be well to note briefly at the outset some of the difficulties involved in the use of each of these

---

1. See above, p. vi. Also Redlich, FC, pp. 26-31, 55ff., 61-68. It should be noted that Bultmann fails to share this assumption.

classes of evidence. The first one, insofar as it concerns the Acts material, immediately presents the question of the source (or sources) of the Acts material. If Luke wrote these speeches himself, as is contended by a number of scholars, then they represent no more than the opinion of a second generation writer as to what constituted the kerygma.[1] They have, in any case, the characteristic of stereotyped formulae which leaves the question open as to how much, if any, reliable information they provide concerning apostolic preaching. Their sameness in style and content in many cases has often been noted but arguments based on this phenomenon can carry the issue in two directions.[2] It can be taken to indicate that Luke was drawing on a well-developed and stereotyped tradition, or it can mean that the uniformity is due to Luke's authorship. The point here is that caution is needed against an over-evaluation of this type of evidence so far as first generation preaching is concerned.

In the case of the second kind of evidence, there are several advantages. For one thing, this type of evidence stands for the most part in the oldest body of writings in the New Testament. In the second place, its indirect character protects it from the kind of creative rewriting that must be suspected in the speeches in Acts, for example. In

---

1. See Cadbury, Art. (1933), pp. 426-27.

2. Cadbury, Art. (1933), p. 407.

the third place, the majority of them occur in the actual writings of the preacher concerned; a fact which helps one to see in these references some indication of what the preacher himself considered important. The disadvantages, on the other hand, appear at two of these same points. These references for the most part are to Paul's preaching and therefore provide a one-sided picture. Also, since they are indirect, they are fragmentary and by themselves do not always guarantee that they are referring to an important item of _kerygma_ content. They certainly leave doubt as to the completeness of their testimony.

That there is early Christian preaching material involved in the case of the Gospel pericopae can be safely assumed. But two difficult questions render this class of material of less probable value than either of the other two. The first is: At what point in the development of the Church did this material crystallize in its present form? The second is: Which of these pericopae were in fact a part of the early _kerygma_ and which are to be traced to other interests and activities of the Church? These questions will be taken up more fully at the end of the chapter.

This survey is not to be construed as an attempt to seek the answer to the content of the _kerygma_ by means of an accumulative total. It is only by a careful analysis and comparison of both the variations and similarities that

a reconstruction of the history of the first generation *kerygma* can be attempted.

2. Specific Accounts of the Kerygma

As this chapter is concerned only with the sources of the evidence for the content of the *kerygma* within the New Testament material, the questions of date and other critical matters involving the value of the evidence will be left for treatment later.

As was mentioned above, the first type of evidence consists of passages that purport to be actual accounts of the content of the *kerygma*. Most of these are the speeches in Acts. The speeches selected in the following survey include those addresses made to non-Christians which contain an appeal for acceptance of the Christian way. There are speeches which have not been included because they are not concerned with this appeal. The *kerygma* in this study, it will be remembered, is understood to be the preaching designed to win adherents to the Church.

The first of these speeches is Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost, Acts 2:4-40. The second is Peter's sermon on the occasion of the healing of the lame man in Solomon's Portico, Acts 3:12-26. Acts 4:8-12 presents Peter making a defense before the Temple authorities after the arrest of the apostles for preaching on the Temple grounds. While this is first of all a defense, it manifestly takes on

the character of kerygma because Peter makes an appeal in his argument for acceptance of the Christian way on the part of the authorities. In Acts 5:20-42, there is presented a series of connected incidents involving the struggle between the priests and the apostles over the matter of preaching in the Name of Jesus. In this passage there are both direct and indirect references to the content of that preaching. Verses 28-32 contain specific words which the author of Acts credits to "Peter and the apostles"; these are undoubtedly meant to be understood as the words of Peter in the role of spokesman for the group.

The next is the account of Stephen's speech on the occasion of his martyrdom. This comprises the bulk of the seventh chapter. In fact, it is in all probability the intention of the author to make the prayer at the moment of his death a part of his total witness; therefore, verses 59 and 60 should be included as a part of the kerygma.

Peter's address to the household of Cornelius, Acts 10:34-43, is the first account of preaching specifically to the gentiles.

The first example of Paul's preaching is contained in Acts 13:16-41 to which, probably, verse 46, which is separated from the speech by narrative material, should be added. A short but very important speech addressed to gentile non-Christians by Paul is contained in Acts 14:15-17. One of the briefest of these direct accounts is contained in Acts

16:31. Acts 17:22-31 is Paul's well-known address to the Athenians on the Areopagus.

The next three passages actually represent Paul's defenses after his arrest in Jerusalem. They are Acts 22:1-21, Acts 24:10-21, and Acts 26:2-27. But as in the case of the defense speeches of Peter in the early portion of Acts, these defenses develop into evangelistic preaching designed to convert the rulers to the Christian way. This is particularly true of the first and last of the three.

There are only two passages outside of Acts that can be included in this category: Romans 1:1-6 and I Cor. 15:1-11. The inclusion of the first of these in this category is justified on two bases. The first is the word "gospel". "Set apart for the gospel of God", is the way Paul describes himself. In the following sentences he purports to outline what that gospel is. He begins with the words, "the gospel concerning his Son", indicating a definite account of his own preaching. There follows an outline of such definite pattern and different style from its context as to indicate the possibility of its independent existence and probably its existence prior to Paul's use of it. Dodd argues convincingly that this was a part of a tradition which Paul had received after his conversion and consequently made use of in his own ministry.[1]

---

1. Dodd, AP, p. 14.

The Corinthian passage is even more clearly of such a nature. "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received", is the way he introduces it. The word παρέλαβον here translated "received" commonly refers to specific tradition or to the process of conveying such tradition. There follows in this case also a clear, balanced outline which stands out in its context and has every mark of a primitive tradition which Paul was simply conveying as basic in his gospel.[1] In any case, the closing words of this paragraph, "Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed", indicate that Paul was deliberately recalling his <u>kerygma</u> to the minds of his readers and that he is conscious of its correspondence to that of the Jerusalem apostles, whether or not he actually admits to having received it from human sources.

It will be noted that these passages include the primary evidence on which Dodd builds the structure of his argument for the <u>kerygma</u> as he has reconstructed it.[2] The content of the <u>kerygma</u> as represented by these accounts, as is to be expected, follows in broad outline the six or seven point pattern which Dodd established in his treatment.[3]

---

1. Dodd, AP, p. 13-14.

2. Dodd, AP, pp. 9-21. It should perhaps be pointed out that Dodd includes Rom. 8:31-32 in this category. See p. 14.

3. Dodd, AP, pp. 17, 21-24. The point of this comparison will be made explicit in discussing the total evidence later.

There are, however, items to be found within these examples which Dodd did not list[1] and a considerable amount of variation in the number and frequency of occurrence of the items in the various instances.[2] This seems to indicate that the problem is not as simple as it appears at first to be. Chart I indicates the distribution and number of items included in this group of the accounts of the kerygma. It is to be admitted, of course, that inasmuch as this analysis is more detailed and therefore lists as separate items ideas that are closely related, a fair comparison of this list with Dodd's summary of the kerygma is hardly possible without first grouping these items into larger and more general categories. Such a grouping will be done at a later point in the study in connection with the evaluation of the evidence.

An X indicates an explicit statement of an item. A question mark indicates a phrase about which there may be some doubt as to whether it does express the idea in question. Such passages must be subjected to detailed, individual examination before an accurate count can be had. This examination will be made in the next chapter. Chart III,

---

1. Note: Appeal to Natural Reason, Early Hebrew History, Power of the Name.

2. Dodd frankly admits the existence of such variety but the question here is: Is he justified in including as much as he does in "the essential elements of the original kerygma"? See AP, p. 74.

ITEMS	Acts 2:14-40	Acts 3:12-26	Acts 4:8-12	Acts 5:20-42	Acts 7:1-60	Acts 10:34-43	Acts 13:16-46	Acts 14:15-17	Acts 16:31	Acts 17:22-31	Acts 22:1-21	Acts 24:10-21	Acts 26:2-27	Rom. 1:1-6	I Cor. 15:1-15
Scriptures Fulfilled	X	X			X	?	X					?	X	X	X
Appeal to Natural Reason								X		X					
Early Hebrew History					X		X								
Davidic Descent	X						X							X	
John the Baptist					?	X	X								
Messiahship	X	X	X	X		X							X	X	X
Lordship	X				X	X			X		X		X	X	
Just One											X				
Servant		X													
Holy or Righteous One	X	X			X		X				X				
Author of Life		X													
Son of God							X							X	
Son of Man					X										
Saviour				X											
Good Life	X	X				X	?								
Crucified	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X		X
Buried	X						X								X
Resurrected	X	X	X			X	X			X	?	?	X	X	X
Exalted	X	?		X	X						?		?		
Followed by the Holy Spirit	X	?		X		?							?		
Power of the Name		X	X	?		X					?		?	X	
Forgiveness of Sins	X	?		X		X	X				?		X		
Salvation	X		X				X		X						X
Eternal Life							X								
Parousia		?													
Jesus as Judge						X				X		?			
Coming Disaster	?														
Call to Repentance	X	X		?			?	X		X			X		
Baptism	X					X					X				
Call to Faith		X				X	X		X		?		X	X	X
Universality of Kerygma						X		?	X	X	X		X		
Command to Preach	?			X		X	X				X		X	X	

CHART I.

Showing Distribution of Items in Direct Evidence

on page 72, shows the results of this examination by circling those question marks which are not counted. The charts show the variety of forms of the kerygma as represented in these passages and the prominence of certain items.

Many of the items in the foregoing chart are self-explanatory and all of them will come up for full discussion in the following chapters, but a few require some comment here. The item "Early Hebrew History" refers to the resumé of the early years of Hebrew history in Stephen's speech in Acts 7 and Paul's sermon in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia in Acts 13:16-46. This is distinguished from other references to the Old Testament included under the item "Scriptures Fulfilled" because here the predictive element has receded and the material--particularly in Stephen's speech--is introduced for somewhat different reasons. Although the resumé in Acts 13 is connected with the claim of Davidic ancestry, the reason for it is not thereby accounted for. As will be shown later, this item is indicative of one of the steps in the development and expansion within the kerygma.

The "Appeal to Natural Reason" refers to the argument in Paul's speeches at Lystra in Acts 14:15-17 and on the Areopague in Acts 17:22-31. The significant fact here is that a reference to natural phenomena and simple affirmation of one God as the Creator of the world replaces all

reference to Hebraic tradition. The term is admittedly somewhat misleading but is used as a matter of brevity and convenience in the charts.

The various appellations used of Jesus have been listed separately, although they are all messianic terms, because an attempt will be made on the basis of a comparison of their use to arrive at an understanding of the meaning of Jesus' Messiahship. It will be observed that a true picture of the emphasis on the Messiahship of Jesus in these accounts of the <u>kerygma</u> will require the total number of all these terms to be added together.

The endowment of the converts with a special power of the Holy Spirit by the pentecostal experience or the laying on of hands is what is referred to in the item "Followed by the Holy Spirit". At several points in the Acts narrative the healing ministry of Jesus is represented as being perpetuated by the use of His Name. In the case of Acts 3:12-26 it becomes the occasion for the <u>kerygma</u> and, therefore, at that point becomes a part of it. This is what is meant by the term "Power of the Name". This is obviously related to the gift of the Holy Spirit.

By the "Universality of <u>Kerygma</u>" is meant the way in which the <u>kerygma</u> proclaimed itself as applying to the gentile as well as to the Jew in contrast to the nationalistic character of Judaism.

3. Incidental and Indirect References

The second type of evidence includes those passages in which the kerygma is referred to in such a way as to indicate something of its contents without actually purporting to quote an example of it. This includes editorial and narrative material in Acts and nearly all of the references to the kerygma in the Epistles.

The brief editorial summaries in Acts furnish a significant commentary on the direct accounts of the kerygma. Exactly what that significance is depends somewhat on the relationship that is conceived to obtain between the speeches and the narratives. If, for instance, the speeches are regarded as the original composition of Luke, probably the editorial passages stand more closely related to the speeches both in time and historical value. If, however, the speeches are understood to have been derived, in part at least, from earlier sources in a similar manner to the narratives, then probably the editorial passages stand alone as the latest strata of Acts and represent the editorial activity of Luke in working over his material. The question is, whether Luke is referring to his own writing or a source he is using.

In any case the editorial passages, from a literary point of view, are more closely related to the narratives than to the speeches. Furthermore, whether they are re-

lated more closely to the narrative or to the speeches in point of time and historical value, they are certainly a part of the latest strand of Acts material and may therefore be regarded as Luke's appraisal of the essence of the preaching. Their function for the speeches is analogous to that of a title for a modern sermon. They indicate what Luke regarded as the main themes of the speeches.

This, of course, does not say that specific editorial material is to be related to specific speeches but simply that these editorial remarks concerning the _kerygma_ express what Luke considers to be the main themes of apostolic preaching.

It will be noticed that when so regarded these passages reveal a variety in the themes of the _kerygma_ of which Luke was conscious. They are evidence therefore that the _kerygma_ was by no means stereotyped. There was a variety of themes in it. It will be shown later, however that this variety is related nevertheless to a definite circle of ideas and that that circle of ideas involves important inner connections which help to indicate its own history and its relationship to the variety. The unity of the _kerygma_ is not to be found in a stereotyped creed-like pattern so much as in a body of ideas which may not always appear in the _kerygma_ but are part of the presuppositions lying back of any given example of it.

There are eleven examples of this editorial material

in Acts: 4:33-35; 5:42; 8:5; 8:12; 11:20; 14:21-23; 17:2-3; 18:5; 18:28; 19:8; 19:26. A glance at the chart at the end of this Section will reveal the variety of themes indicated by these editorial comments.[1]

Acts 9:19-22 and 17:2-3 represent a combination of direct account and editorial reference. These passages may be regarded as editorial. It is hardly likely that these direct quotations represent anything more than Luke's attempt to add variety and vividness to his narrative.

A second type of indirect references to the kerygma occurs in the speeches which are not themselves kerygma but refer to it or comment on it. Some of these speeches are by the apostles and the church while others are by the opposition. Since the function of these brief speeches appears to be either to embellish or to further the narrative, the possibility that they were invented for that purpose by Luke must be kept in mind. But at least they reveal something of Luke's understanding of the situation. This is particularly true of such passages as the direct quotations of the Temple authorities which may well be regarded as no more than elaborate editorial expansions of the narratives.

A notable example of material indirectly bearing on the kerygma is contained in Acts 4:24-30. This prayer represents the "friends" of Peter and John--evidently the Church--rejoic-

---

1. Below, p. 28.

ing in the power that has been manifested through them by the Holy Spirit. While only one sentence of this prayer, contained in verse 29, actually refers to the kerygma, the entire prayer is occasioned by the boldness of Peter and John in proclaiming it. Therefore it is safe to assume that the entire content of this prayer was understood by Luke to have been involved in the kerygma. The prayer has been so treated in the following chart.

Acts 5:28 quotes a charge levelled at the apostles by the high priest before the Jewish council. If it were not for the question of Luke's source for the narrative, this particular speech would have considerable value in establishing the emphasis in the apostolic kerygma. For one thing it represents an outsider's impression of that preaching. But in the light of the tendency of Luke, so manifest elsewhere, this brief passage has all the earmarks of a well-worked piece of editorial expansion. Its historical value is probably not great. It may, however, be argued with good reason that this speech reflects Luke's knowledge of the primitive Christian conflict with the Jews over the crime of the crucifixion. If this be admitted the basic value of this passage is assured.

A somewhat similar situation is presented by the introductory section of the story of the martyrdom of Stephen, Acts 6:12-14. Luke is here setting the stage for the long

speech of Stephen. Charges are being levelled at Stephen which Luke is very careful to maintain are false.

There is an interesting parallel between the charge of blasphemy against the temple levelled at Stephen and the charge brought against Jesus at his trial in Mark 14:58 (Mt. 26:61). It will be noted that Luke in his version of the trial of Jesus omits this reference to the destruction of the Temple. Is it possible that this tradition, while omitted in Luke's account of the trial of Jesus, is known by him as an independent tradition and introduced here?[1] For the charge against Stephen makes it clear that he is understood to have credited Jesus with this statement about the Temple. Such a possibility fits in well with the theory of Form Criticism that the sayings often circulated loosely in the tradition and were originally quite independent of the narrative settings in which they are found within the New Testament.[2] If this is so, the statement that Jesus made this remark about the destruction the Temple has more historic likelihood than that Stephen included it in his preaching. Probably, the historical value of this speech against Stephen for the purposes of this study is not great.

In the course of Luke's story of the Jerusalem confer-

---

1. Cf. Acts 1:7 and Mk. 13:32; Acts 9:40 and Mk. 13:32. Cited in Foakes-Jackson, BC, Vol. IV, p. 134.

2. This is Bultmann's theory. For a detailed exposition see his Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck, 1921.

ence in Acts 15 there occur two speeches (7-11 by Peter and 13-21 by James) which represent phases of an argument over the kerygma. The question under discussion is the relation of the kerygma to the gentiles.

The significant thing about these speeches is that Paul's discussion in Galatians 2 of the same problem provides a control for testing their historical value. This is true in a general sense whether or not the identity of the occasion in Acts 15 and Galatians 2 is admitted. At least the issue is identical and the general facts that the issue was up before the Church and that it proceeded somewhat along the lines indicated by Luke are well attested.

The question of the correspondence of Acts and Luke on the matter of Paul's visits to Jerusalem is too moot and unimportant for this study to be considered further. But it is nevertheless safe to conclude that, regardless of the difficulties in reconciling Acts 11, and/or 15 with Galatians 2, Luke's source for Acts 15 is ultimately connected with the Jerusalem conference described by Paul in Galatians 2.[1] This is sufficient to establish the value of the evidence concerning the kerygma. To what definite conclusions this evidence leads will be discussed later.

---

1. This conclusion is based in part on the summary of proposed solutions in the suggestive discussion of this question by Morton Scott Enslin, CB, pp. 227-30. See also John Knox, Chapters In a Life of Paul, (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1950), Ch. IV.

Acts 20:18-35 presents a quite different situation. This is Paul's speech at Miletus addressed to the elders of the Ephesian church. The historical questions in connection with this speech are to be considered on a par with those of the other major speeches in Acts. It is too long and its content too varied and detailed to be regarded as mere editorial expansion; nor is the nature of its argument such as to make it essential to the progress of the narrative. Therefore, it seems safe enough to regard as accurate the allusions to Paul's preaching to the best of Luke's knowledge. The relevance of this passage for this study consists in the allusions to Paul's previous preaching in Ephesus. The specific verses in this connection are 20-21, 24-25, 27-28. But it should also be kept in mind that the preaching to which he refers in these three passages is presupposed, and lies in the background of the entire speech.

Acts 23:6 has been included although it is not properly a part of the *kerygma* because it represents Paul as summarizing the element of his preaching which had precipitated his arrest. Manifestly, Luke means to depict the cleverness of Paul in diverting his opponents by turning them against one another. But it cannot thereby be assumed that Luke did not mean also to indicate the resurrection as a cardinal doctrine in Paul's preaching. Again, the chief historical value of this passage lies in the fact that it represents Luke's estimate of Paul's *kerygma*.

The passage in Acts 25:19 is taken from Festus' speech in which he summarizes Paul's case to Agrippa. It is not immediately apparent in this case that reference is being made to Paul's preaching, because the sentence is actually a statement of the case presented against Paul by his accusers in their appearance before the governor. What appears at first to be the case is that this is a reference only to legal proceedings before the tribunal. When, however, this speech is considered in the setting of Luke's entire account of Paul's trials after his arrest in Jerusalem it becomes obvious that the charges which the Jews were bringing against Paul were connected with his preaching.

It was in his preaching that Paul had asserted Jesus to be alive. Therefore, if the historicity of this speech could be established it would provide a valuable piece of evidence because of the fact that it reflects the impression made by Paul's preaching upon his opponents. However, there are serious difficulties with regard to this speech, because there is less likelihood of an actual source in this case than in that of many of the earlier speeches in Acts. The question of how what Festus had said to Agrippa could be known, since it is not represented to be a letter or public address, makes it doubly questionable that this is any more than the creative imagination of Luke working over his historical material.

This much, however, may be said, that to Luke's know-

ledge such was the impression apostolic preaching left on the minds of the Jewish opposition. There is good reason to believe that Luke is presenting a sound historical picture of the general tenor of the conflict between the Jews and the Christians in the first generation. If this is so then this passage is indicative of the main emphasis of apostolic preaching.

The last of this group of speeches occurs in Acts 28:17-28. It is represented to be Paul's speech to the Jews in Rome upon his arrival. There is nothing particularly significant in the speech and it is highly unlikely that it has any more historical value than any other of Luke's estimates of Paul's emphasis in preaching.

The bulk of the remaining material in the following chart is from the Pauline letters and, as was pointed out at the beginning of this chapter,[1] it represents the oldest authentic statements concerning the kerygma.

By its very nature, this material cannot be taken as an explicit and full account of the preaching of Paul. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that any important idea used by Paul in evangelizing the churches addressed in his extant letters would fail to appear somewhere in these letters. Rather, it is altogether possible that the ideas which are introduced with such words as "according to my

---

1. Above, p. 8.

gospel" are exactly those ideas around which his gospel developed.

The passages selected from the Epistles for study have been limited to those which are explicitly associated with evangelistic preaching[1] by some such phrase as, "according to my gospel",[2] "we persuade men",[3] "my speech and my message",[4] etc.

The question of the authenticity of Ephesians need not be considered here. Regardless of actual authorship, its thought lies safely within Paulinism. More specifically, it will be noted in the chart that every item attributed to the kerygma in Ephesians is paralleled in other Pauline letters.

Five references have been included from the post-Pauline literature. Their chief value lies in the fact that they furnish a perspective from a later period by which to view the lines of development and the constant elements in the kerygma.

In two of these passages there occur manifest formulae, I Timothy 3:16 and II Timothy 2:11-13. Probably these, as

---

1. Dodd's use of Rom. 8:31-34, for instance, is based on the assumption "that a formula is being cited. . ." The difficulty with this is that there is no good reason for associating such a formula with the kerygma. It may quite as well be a catechetical or liturgical fragment. See AP, pp. 14-15.

2. Rom. 2:16.

3. II Cor. 5:11.

4. I Cor. 2:4.

ITEMS / PASSAGES	ACTS 4:1-2	ACTS 4:24-30	ACTS 4:33-35	ACTS 5:42	ACTS 6:12-14	ACTS 8:5-12	ACTS 8:31-37	ACTS 9:19-22	ACTS 11:20	ACTS 14:21-23	ACTS 15:7-11	ACTS 15:13-21	ACTS 17:2,3,7	ACTS 18:5	ACTS 18:28	ACTS 19:4	ACTS 19:8
SCRIPTURES FULFILLED		x					x					x	x		x		
APPEAL TO NATURAL REASON																	
DAVIDIC DESCENT												?					
JOHN THE BAPTIST																x	
MESSIAHSHIP		x		x		x	?	x					x	x	x		
LORDSHIP			x						x	?	x						
SERVANT		x															
SON OF GOD								x									
SAVIOR																	
LIKENESS OF GOD																	
KING													x				
GOOD LIFE																	
CRUCIFIED		?					?						x				
BURIED																	
RESURRECTED	?		x										x				
EXALTED																	
FOLLOWED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT		?									x						
POWER OF THE NAME		x				?											
FORGIVENESS OF SINS																	
SALVATION											x						
ETERNAL LIFE																	
PAROUSIA					?												
JESUS AS JUDGE																	
KINGDOM OF GOD						x				x							x
MYSTERY																	
COMING DISASTER																	
CALL TO REPENTANCE																?	
BAPTISM						x	x									?	
CALL TO FAITH						x	x			x	x					x	
UNIVERSALITY OF THE KERYGMA							?		?		x						
COMMAND TO PREACH											?						

ITEMS / PASSAGES	ACTS 19:26	ACTS 20:18-35	ACTS 23:6	ACTS 24:24-25	ACTS 25:19	ACTS 28:17-28	ROM. 1:16	ROM. 2:16	ROM. 10:8,9	ROM. 10:17	ROM. 15:19	ROM. 16:25-26	I COR. 1:17-18	I COR. 1:23-24	I COR. 2:2-5	II COR. 1:18-19	II COR. 4:4-14
SCRIPTURES FULFILLED						x						x					
APPEAL TO NATURAL REASON	x			x								x					
DAVIDIC DESCENT																	
JOHN THE BAPTIST																	
MESSIAHSHIP		x		x				x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
LORDSHIP		x							x								x
SERVANT																	
SON OF GOD																x	
SAVIOR																	
LIKENESS OF GOD																	x
KING																	
GOOD LIFE																	
CRUCIFIED		?			x								?	x	x		?
BURIED																	
RESURRECTED			?		x				x								x
EXALTED																	
FOLLOWED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT											?				x		
POWER OF THE NAME																	
FORGIVENESS OF SINS																	
SALVATION						x	x		x				x	?			
ETERNAL LIFE																	
PAROUSIA																	
JESUS AS JUDGE								?									
KINGDOM OF GOD		x				x											
MYSTERY												x					
COMING DISASTER				x									x				
CALL TO REPENTANCE		x															
BAPTISM																	
CALL TO FAITH		x		x		x	x		x	x		x			?		x
UNIVERSALITY OF THE KERYGMA	?																
COMMAND TO PREACH		?				x				?		?	?				?

ITEMS / PASSAGES	II COR. 5:11-21	GAL. 2:14-21	GAL. 3:1	EPH. 3:8-12	EPH. 6:19	PHIL. 1:18	COL. 1:4-5	COL. 1:21-23	COL. 2:6-15	I THESS. 1:5	I THESS. 1:9-10	I THESS. 2:13-15	I TIM. 3:16	II TIM. 1:8-12	II TIM. 2:2-13	TITUS 1:1-3	I PET. 1:10-12
SCRIPTURES FULFILLED														?		x	x
APPEAL TO NATURAL REASON				x													
DAVIDIC DESCENT															x		
JOHN THE BAPTIST																	
MESSIAHSHIP	x	x	x	x		x	x		x			x		x	x	x	x
LORDSHIP				x					x			x		?			
SERVANT																	
SON OF GOD											x						
SAVIOR														x		x	
LIKENESS OF GOD																	
KING																	
GOOD LIFE	x																
CRUCIFIED	x		x					x	?			x		x	x		x
BURIED									?								
RESURRECTED	x								x		x				x		
EXALTED							?						x				?
FOLLOWED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT										x							x
POWER OF THE NAME																	
FORGIVENESS OF SINS	?								x								
SALVATION														x			x
ETERNAL LIFE																x	
PAROUSIA											x			?			
JESUS AS JUDGE																	
KINGDOM OF GOD															?		
MYSTERY				x										x			
COMING DISASTER											x						
CALL TO REPENTANCE	x																
BAPTISM									x								
CALL TO FAITH		x		x	x			?				x	x			x	
UNIVERSALITY OF THE KERYGMA													x				
COMMAND TO PREACH	x			x									?	x		x	?

CHART II.

SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS IN INDIRECT EVIDENCE

they stand, are not a part of the *kerygma* but are distillations from it which belong among either the liturgical or catechetical material. The latter occurs in connection with a direct reference to preaching and the former refers to it; therefore they have been included. Chart II indicates the distribution and number of items found in this material.

4. The Synoptic Gospels and the Kerygma

A subordinate place must be assigned to the Synoptic materials in amassing the evidence for the content and development of the *kerygma*. This is true in spite of the fact that Dodd has very carefully analyzed the Synoptic Gospels, particularly Mark, to show that there is what "may be regarded as an expanded form of what we may call the historical section of the *kerygma*".[1]

In the first place, not much can be made of the use of the word "Gospel" in the naming of these books.[2] In the second place, the remarkable similarity in sequence which Dodd has pointed out can be accounted for in large measure by the simple necessity of a natural order of events. Henry J. Cadbury has pointed out that the correspondence between the outlines of the *kerygma* in Acts and a broad outline of

---

1. Dodd, AP, pp. 46-47. Ropes finds a quite different motif underlying Mark. See SG, p. 10.

2. Dodd, AP, pp. 51-52.

the Gospel of Mark is the result of a rather inescapable outline forced upon the writings by necessity. Logically, the resurrection must come following the death of Jesus which in turn must come at the end of His life, and so on. So that the correspondence with the Acts kerygma, upon the basis of which Dodd argues the significance of the Synoptics for his study, becomes much less weighty than it might at first appear.[1]

If, however, the form and outline of the Synoptics can provide no significant help in tracing the kerygma, cannot the content of the Gospels be viewed as preaching materials? The probability that much of the material in the Gospels was formed within the preaching activities of the Church has already been mentioned, as was the difficulty in determining exactly what and how much of this material was so formed and how much must be attributed to other activities and interests.[2]

There are, nevertheless, in the Synoptic materials certain indications of that which the Synoptic writers must have regarded as the antecedents of apostolic preaching. In the nature of the case, these materials would become influen-

---

1. In a conversation with the writer on this point, Spring, 1953.

2. Above, p. 9.

tial and authoritative for apostolic preaching. For instance, in Mark 1:4 and parallels (including John 1:15-36) the message of John the Baptist undoubtedly was brought into line by early tradition with the apostolic message to make him a precursor of the kerygma. This would be in line with the New Testament treatment elsewhere of the problem of John the Baptist.

The announcement of Jesus in Mark 1:14 presents him as preaching, "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel". Matthew 4:17 gives a close parallel to this. While Luke does not, his account of Jesus' preaching in the Nazareth synagogue (Luke 4:16-27) clearly takes its place. In any case, Jesus is represented in the Synoptics as proclaiming the coming of the kingdom and calling for repentance. As was indicated above, John's preaching is brought into line with this message.

It will be shown later that the coming of the kingdom is closely related to the central ideas of the apostolic kerygma. It is not difficult, therefore, to believe that there is an obvious relationship between what the Early Church recorded as the preaching of Jesus and what it would feel to be the right preaching for itself. This will be brought into consideration in the course of the study.

Another series of Synoptic parallels which may safely be regarded as relevant to the kerygma is the commissioning

of the disciples on their mission, Matthew 9:36-11:1; Mark 6:7-13; Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-16. Whether or not the sending out of the twelve and the seventy in Luke are doublets is unimportant here, for in all cases the essence of the commission is markedly similar and may be viewed as the charter of early apostolic preaching.

Two other Synoptic passages are in direct enough connection with the kerygma to justify their being used here. In fact these passages are among the most applicable of all the Synoptic material to apostolic preaching. One is Matthew 28:16-20 which contains the familiar "great commission". This passage represents Jesus as giving the direct command from which the authority for apostolic preaching proceeded. The other is Luke 24:46-49. This passage, clearly anticipating the opening section of Acts, is no less an authorization of the kerygma. But in addition it claims for the early Christian practice of appealing to Scriptural prophecy in support of the kerygma no less an authority than Jesus Himself.

There are many other passages which probably are related to apostolic preaching, historically, but their identity is insufficiently certain to justify their use in this study. The Synoptic material will not be treated in the charts. In the nature of the case it does not appear to lend itself to such treatment nor is the content extensive enough to warrant it.

Chapter III

ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE SHOWING THE NATURE OF THE *KERYGMA*

In the preceding chapter the New Testament evidence upon which the conclusions of this dissertation will be based were presented and classified. It will be the task of this chapter to analyze the evidence to discover insofar as possible the nature of the *kerygma* at the New Testament level. It is assumed that this *kerygma* was the product of a process of development, and that that development took place under influences and circumstances which, if they can be reconstructed with any degree of accuracy, will enable the investigator to plot its course.

The concern of this study, therefore, in attempting to establish the content of apostolic preaching during the first period of the Church's expansion is not for its own sake, but rather for the purpose of establishing a starting point from which to retrace the lines of development that led to it from the time of the crucifixion.

The wide variation in both frequency and distribution of the items shown in the charts in Chapter II[1] seems to provide sufficient justification for assuming that not all the items appearing at one time or another in the *kerygma* are of equal importance or significance with regard to its

---

1. See pp. 15, 28.

nature. Therefore, it will be the task of this chapter to attempt an analysis of the evidence into central and peripheral items.

The problem at this point is by no means easy to solve. It is necessary constantly to be on guard against the fallacy of attaching too much importance to what may be, in part at least, statistical accident.

It may reasonably be assumed, nevertheless, that when an item appearing most frequently in the kerygma displays, either intrinsically or in its correspondence with major emphases elsewhere in the New Testament, an importance to apostolic thought, its frequency in the kerygma is not accidental. Furthermore, the extent of the frequency has some serious bearing on the problem. If, for instance, an item appears in almost every example and in the cases in which it does not appear the account is manifestly fragmentary and only incidentally concerned with the kerygma, or appears to assume the item, then that item may safely be listed as essential to the kerygma. Also, in determining what is central and what is peripheral, the circumstances with which the account in question is associated may indicate the reason for the inclusion of the particular items at that point, thus providing a control in determining statistical accidents.

Once a center has been established the problem of this chapter becomes somewhat easier. The logical connections

will serve as controls in judging the significance of the frequency of items. Also concomitant items will merit special attention. If an item appears to be present either explicitly or by implication with every appearance of another item, a logical connection is to be looked for which quite possibly will provide a clue to the reason for its appearance in the kerygma at all. If, on the other hand, an item appears with no more claim to importance than a numerical majority, it cannot be assumed, a priori, that it occupies a central or significant place in the kerygma. Its function in the latter in each case remains to be examined.

In all cases, it must be remembered that the oldest and best evidence--the Pauline letters--is fragmentary, incidental, and appears in particular situations not directly concerned with evangelization. Therefore the possibility of the frequency of certain items being due to statistical accident is manifestly great. The same may be said, in a lesser degree, of the material in Acts.

1. Examination of Items Marked "?"

Before the main argument of the chapter is taken up, one important matter must be considered. In the charts in the last chapter, the checking of occurrences which might be questioned[1] was done with a question mark. Each of these

1. See pp. 15, 28.

instances must now be examined in detail to determine whether it is in fact an occurrence of the item in question.

In Acts 2:14-40 the item "coming disaster" is checked with a question mark. The item refers to allusions to a future crisis or dire fate for unbelievers. The idea seems to bear a close relationship to the notion of messianic woes and/or judgment. The reason for questioning this occurrence is that unless the phrase, "this crooked generation", is taken as such a reference, which is doubtful, the only reference to this theme is contained in the quotation from Joel:

> And I will show wonders in the heaven above
> and signs on the earth beneath,
> blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke;
> the sun shall be turned into darkness
> and the moon into blood,
> before the day of the Lord comes. . . .

Since the main point of contact of this quotation with the speech lies in its reference to the outpouring of the Spirit, it might be questioned whether it is legitimate to hold the speaker responsible for other ideas contained in the quotation.

On the other hand, two points should be noted. In the first place, when a text was taken out of context for such a purpose as this, only the relevant portion of the text was quoted. There is, therefore, in the very practice of rabbinic exegesis some justification for taking this entire

quotation seriously. Of more importance is the manner in which the quotation is introduced into the speech. The words, ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις [1] provide the key for understanding the Pentecostal phenomenon. Without these words the point of the quotation is lost. Furthermore, the end of the quotation and the end of the speech show a significant correspondence. The point is that the manifestation of the Spirit signals an urgent reason for seeking salvation. This urgent reason is not sufficiently explicit in the body of the speech taken by itself, but if the latter is seen as an explanation of the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy and a proof that it is indeed being fulfilled, the implication is inescapable that the heavenly portents are a real part of the argument and the urgent reason for being saved is the nearness of the messianic tribulation and judgment.

The argument of the speech runs something as follows: The phenomenon which you attribute to drunkenness is actually the outpouring of the Spirit by God, made possible by the exaltation of Jesus, whom you crucified, (this exaltation was also prophecied by David). All this is in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy that God would pour out His Spirit in the last days on the eve of the messianic tribulation. Those who call "on the name of the Lord shall be

---

1. It is to be noted that these words were added to the quotation by Luke.

saved." Therefore, "save yourselves. . ." If this interpretation of the speech is correct, the inclusion of this passage as an occurrence of the item, "Coming Disaster", is justified. It will be so treated in the analysis.

It follows from the same line of argument that the "Command to Preach" is also implicit in this passage. If the speech is based on a serious attempt to demonstrate the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy in the Pentecostal experience, this automatically makes the prophecy justify the speech itself. For the apostles were simply doing what Joel said that, under the outpouring of the Spirit, they would do. They were simply obeying the mandate of the Spirit. The narrative setting of this speech makes it clear that Luke intended the speech to be so understood. Peter was not the only speaker in the story, (see 2:6), but it is he who explains that they are speaking under the compulsion of the Spirit. Doubtless the latter and more explicit statements of the "Command to Preach" are simply expansions of this theory of the compulsion of the Spirit to prophesy. At any rate, the passage may be taken as the first instance in Acts of this item which has a definite place in the kerygma.

There are four items checked with question marks in the case of Acts 3:12-26. The first of these, "Exalted", is implied in the words, "whom heaven must receive. . ." That the word "exalted" was used in a quite literal fashion in

Acts is apparent from the account of the ascension (Acts 1:9ff), Stephen's vision (Acts 7:56), and the use of the phrase, "at the right hand of God" in connection with it (Acts 2:33; 5:31). This exaltation performed an eschatological function, as will be shown in the next chapter. Since the exaltation meant the placing of Jesus in heaven at the "right hand of God," this phrase may be taken as a clear implication of that idea and will be so treated.

The item "Followed by the Holy Spirit" seems to be implied in the phrase "times of refreshing". The phrase may well have Hosea 6:3 and 10:12 lying back of it, in which case it refers to the blessed visitation of God upon His people. This would naturally mean the bestowal of His Spirit as the agency of His coming. But whether this phrase represents any such idea as the spectacular phenomenon in Joel or simply refers to the visitation of God in the messianic consummation is difficult to determine. ἀναψύξεως may quite properly be taken to refer to the blessings of the messianic era. This instance seems doubtful enough to warrant leaving it an open question. It will, therefore, not be counted in this analysis.

It is quite otherwise in the case of the next item, "Forgiveness of Sins". The phrase, "that your sins may be blotted out", is obviously synonymous with, "for the forgiveness of your sins", in 2:38, and will be so taken here.

Likewise the phrase, "that He may send the Christ

appointed for you", (Acts 3:20), standing as it does in the sequence here as a future contingency, may be taken as a clear expression of the parousia idea. This is made more certain by the connection of the sending of Christ with the reception of Jesus by heaven until the "time for establishing all that God spoke. . ." This occurrence will also be treated as established.

Taken by itself, the phrase, "proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection", (Acts 4:1-2), does not claim to be a reference to Jesus' resurrection. What it more directly refers to is the resurrection of the dead at the arrival of the messianic age. This is brought about by Jesus who is the Messiah.

But in the light of the fact that this resurrection is accomplished by the Messiah Jesus, and that elsewhere in Acts the messianic power of Jesus is associated with his own resurrection, (Acts 2:32-33; 3:15-16; 4:10; etc.), this mention of the resurrection must be thought of as including Jesus' own resurrection. Such will be the assumption of this survey.

It is quite evident in the case of Acts 4:24-30 that the crucifixion is being referred to in the words, "to do whatever Thy hand and Thy plan had predestined to take place." The circumlocution is due to an attempt to adapt the language of the prayer to the prophetic quotation to make the applicability of the latter clear.

The question as to whether the Holy Spirit is meant in

the phrase, "while Thou stretchest out Thy hand to heal," is somewhat more difficult. At first glance it would seem that this is a reference to the special activity of God in connection with the nearness of the messianic age closely allied with the outpouring of the Spirit, as in the Joel quotation (Acts 2:17-21). This would make it a paraphrase of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit.

While this phrase is undoubtedly to be understood as such a special activity of God, there are good reasons against associating it with the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Although it probably should not be drawn too sharply, there is a distinction to be made between the gift of the Holy Spirit and the "Power of the Name". In the first place, nowhere in Acts is the Holy Spirit directly associated with miracles of healing, unusual physical phenomena and the like.[1] On the other hand, when the source

---

1. The only two passages that can be urged against this statement are 8:39 and 10:38. In the first of these there is a manifest looseness of terminology. It may be argued from 5:1-11, on the basis of the theorem that two things equal to the same thing are equal to each other, that the "Holy Spirit" and the "Spirit of the Lord" are synonymous. Therefore the miraculous removal of Philip is a physical phenomenon associated with the Holy Spirit. But by the same theorem the "angel of the Lord" (8:26) --who actually performs an office usual to the Holy Spirit--is synonymous with the "Spirit of the Lord" and therefore with the Holy Spirit. Surely it would not do to speak of being "filled with the 'Angel of the Lord'" as in 2:4! As a matter of fact, if the terms in question (8:26 and 8:39) were exchanged, the usage would conform quite naturally with that of the rest of Acts. It is to be noted also that the miracle was not performed by Philip through the agency of the Spirit but rather

of miracles is mentioned, they are usually the result of the power of the "Name" of Jesus as in the case of the clause following the one in question.

The gift of the Holy Spirit, in the second place, occupies a specific place in Acts. Probably Luke actually thought of the ultimate nature of these two manifestations of divine power as being the same. Yet he uses the term Holy Spirit to denote a particular type of that power. It is only manifest following certain conditions, i. e. baptism

---

performed directly upon him much as in Peter's delivery from prison (12:6ff). In any case, this passage is not sufficiently decisive to affect the impression left by the rest of the book. It is quite possible that Luke's sources are to be held responsible for this deviation from his customary usage. Perhaps the background of 8:39 is the story of the translation of Elijah (II Kings 2:1-18) in which case the phraseology here is made to conform to Old Testament usage rather than that usual to Luke. (See esp. II Kings 2:16).

10:38 can only apply in this connection if it is concluded that the phrase, "with the Holy Spirit and with power", is a parallelism and that it is grammatically related to the next clause in such a way as to become the explanation of Jesus' healings. If the punctuation of the RSV be accepted, this is not necessary. Rather, the phrase, "for God was with him", becomes the explanation and the two clauses are correlatives. The background of this passage is undoubtedly Luke's Gospel. There is nothing in the latter to upset the conclusion here advanced. (Note the connection into which the Spirit is brought in Lk. 4:1, 14ff, etc.). It should be noted, however, that the Holy Spirit and "power" are related in 1:8, but here both are connected with being "witnesses".

and, usually,[1] the laying on of hands. Therefore, it cannot be the Holy Spirit in this sense that works miracles on those not yet received into the Church. So it is an angel and not the Spirit that instructs Cornelius to send for Peter (Acts 10:22). The Holy Spirit inspires courage, speaking in tongues, prophecy, and guidance in those who have properly received it. The distinction is not absolute, however, for although it was the Holy Spirit who warned Paul of what awaited him in Jerusalem, it was the Lord who stood by him during the storm enroute to Rome (cf. Acts 20:33 and 27:23, also 23:11). The Holy Spirit appears to be a technical term for a specific phenomenon in Acts. If this is true, the phrase in question cannot be a paraphrase of it but must refer to the succeeding clause and concern the "Power of the Name". It will not be counted in the statistics.

At first reading, the mention of "this name" in Acts 5:28 seems merely to refer to the subject matter of the apostolic preaching rather than any power connected thereto. For that reason the listing of this as an occurrence of the "Power of the Name" in the chart is done with a question

---

1. Cornelius is an exception (Acts 10:44), although the place of this story in Luke's theme of the gentile mission may explain the exception here. The bestowal of the Holy Spirit is in Acts one of the proofs of Divine approval. Thus it was the bestowal of the Holy Spirit that encouraged Peter to baptize the gentile household.

mark.[1] It will be noted, however, that Peter's reply to this charge reaches its climax in the forgiveness of sins. This is one of the accomplishments of the "Power of the Name" (Acts 10:43). The use of the "Name" in the working of wonders appears to be closely allied with its use in baptism. The emphasis on this point in Acts hardly allows it to be understood as a figure of speech.[2] One of the points of contact between the use of the "Name" in baptism and in the working of wonders is the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, taken together and in the light of other more explicit passages in Acts, the high priest's charge and Peter's reply (5:28 and 31) seem strongly to imply that Peter had been proclaiming the power of the Name of Jesus to accomplish the forgiveness of sins.

Although this passage is a defense rather than an example of the <u>kerygma</u>, the "Call to Repentance" is attested because it is a defense of the right to preach repentance which has been given by Jesus. The fact that it has been "given" becomes the mandate that it be preached.

The fact that Luke treats the testimony to the preaching of Stephen in Acts 6:13, 14 as malicious falsehood (μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς) raises the question as to whether it ought to be used at all as evidence of <u>kerygma</u> content. The

---

1. The question of the use of the Name of Jesus will come up for discussion again in the course of this section.

2. New, Art.(1933), pp. 121-140.

real question, however, is whether Luke is justified in branding this testimony as false.

The marked similarity of this account to the same point in the trial of Jesus according to Matthew and Mark was pointed out in the previous chapter.[1] In both accounts the testimony against Jesus is called ἐψευδομαρτύρουν. But the fact that both Evangelists have previously recorded such a saying of Jesus as authentic (Mt. 24:2; Mk. 13:2) demands an explanation. In what sense was this testimony false? It is this explanation which the writer of the Fourth Gospel sought to provide in 2:19ff. The whole tenor of this latter passage suggests an attempt to deal with an embarrassing tradition by allegorizing it.

The fact that it appears eight times in the Gospels and Acts, and that three times (including the Mk.-Matt. parallels) it is placed on the lips of those deriding Jesus at the crucifixion, and once it is allegorized, suggests that it occupied no small place in the tradition but at the same time it was somewhat embarrassing.

Perhaps Luke's omission of this tradition in his Gospel and his assignment of it to Stephen's accusers is to be seen as a way of further removing the embarrassment. At any rate, it seems likely enough that such a saying was attributed

---

1. See p. 22.

to Jesus by his followers and that it was found in the <u>kerygma</u>. The branding of this as "falsehood", then, must have resulted either from a misinterpretation of its meaning by the opposition or from a change in ideas on the part of the Church which made the saying intolerable and required that it be disposed of in one way or another.[1] Luke is, in all probability, not correct, therefore, if he means to say that the apostolic preaching did not contain a temple-destroying saying. To this he bears unintentional witness by attempting to discredit it here.

The primary question for this section of the study must now be faced if the above reasoning is accepted: Is this an implied reference to the "<u>Parousia</u>"? Assuming that the Fourth Gospel explanation is not correct, the saying must have concerned the future of the actual Temple. Whether its original form was a simple statement that the Temple would be destroyed, as in Mark 13:2 and parallels, and developed into the form in which it occurs as a false accusation against Jesus in Mark 14:58 and parallel is difficult to determine. But in any case it is most probable that the saying was eschatological rather than a simple prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. Unless the two forms are entirely unrelated and therefore actually two separate sayings, the rebuilding of the Temple in three days definitely decides the

---

1. That both these possibilities have strong likelihood of being the case will be discussed in the next chapter.

question in favor of the eschatological meaning.[1] There was a tradition in late Judiasm that Jerusalem would be replaced by a heavenly city[2] and that the Temple would be destroyed and replaced by a new and eternal one.[3] Whether it originated with Jesus or was applied to Him later (perhaps as a development from the simpler, impersonal form?) it seems logical to associate it with this tradition. That the saying proved to be an embarrassment explains the Evangelists' handling of it. Under the circumstances, then, it must have formed a phase of the parousia hope. The charge leveled against Stephen was preaching that Jesus was a threat to the Temple. This could only mean an event in the parousia. That it was actually a part of the kerygma--whether Stephen's or not--seems most likely and will be so treated here.

The next question concerns the possibility of a reference to John the Baptist in Acts 7:52. Except for two considerations this would seem very probable, especially in the light of the Gospel tradition which assigned to John precisely the role of messianic herald. This possibility is further strengthened by the fact that in Paul's speech in

---

1. It is to be admitted that the saying could have originated as such a simple prediction and developed into an eschatological one but the issue here concerns not what Jesus might have said but what the tradition made of it.

2. IV Ezra 10.

3. The Apocalypse of Baruch 4:1-6; 32:2-4. See also note on 4:3 in Charles, AB, pp. 6-7. Cf. Rev. 21:2, 22.

13:16-41, which bears a marked similarity to this speech in that it is the only other speech containing a survey of "Early Hebrew History", John the Baptist's ministry is included as a part of the survey. With the exception of Peter's speech in 10:34-43, where John's baptism is mentioned incidentally as the starting point of Jesus' public ministry (cf. 1:22), Paul's speech is the ~~only~~ explicit mention of the Baptist in connection with the <u>kerygma</u>. The point is, that the line of argument is the same--and unique among Acts speeches--in chapter 7 and 13, and that in the latter John becomes the final stage in the historical anticipation of Jesus. The phrase in question stands in exactly the same connection in chapter 7. From this it may appear that Luke had John in mind here.

The two considerations referred to above, however, prevent any definite conclusion on the point. In the first place, the use of the plural (τοὺς προκαταγγείλαντας) seems to make the phrase a parallel of the previous one, in which case it is simply a reference to the ancient prophets. At any rate, the plural form eliminates an exclusive reference to John. This point is further strengthened by the fact that it is the fathers (οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν) who are accused of killing the predictors of "the coming of the Righteous One". If the death of John had been intended, the "fathers" would hardly have been the accused. Because of the in-

definiteness of the passage, it will be left out of account here.

The question of the significance of the "Name" arises again in Acts 8:12. Here it is associated with baptism and therefore might be supposed to belong in a different category. But what is intended by "Power of the Name" is not simply its use in the perpetuation of miracles but the whole idea of its efficacy. Baptism, in order to be efficacious must be in the "Name". Thus the Ephesian believers must be rebaptized (19:1-7). But once this is done, the Holy Spirit is given and the full power of membership in the messianic community is theirs. In 22:16, Paul is to be baptized "calling on his name", and in 26:9, he confesses to having opposed the "Name". The attitude toward the "Name" is similar in Romans 1:5. In all these cases there is an efficacy in the "Name" itself.

Probably Luke thought of the spiritual phenomena associated with baptism, and the like, as on the same supernatural level as the physical miracles. This seems evident in his treatment of the gift of tongues. Therefore, the significance of the "Name" in all these cases is assumed to be the same and will be so handled.

The account of Philip's conversation with the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8:31-37 occasions three question marks on the chart. The first two of these may be considered together.

The question in this case is whether the messiahship and crucifixion of Jesus are implied.

It is evident at the outset that Luke assumes certain knowledge on the part of his readers for the understanding of this story. Henry J. Cadbury has pointed out the way in which Luke omits in one passage steps in the logic of his argument which appear in his recording of others so that the speeches must be taken together in order to see the underlying reasoning.[1] This is certainly true here. The passage makes it clear that Philip answers the eunuch's question as to whom the prophet is describing by telling him "the good news of Jesus". But it is not made clear, when this passage is taken by itself, how this answer leads to the eunuch's baptism. It is obvious, therefore, that Luke assumes that his readers understand the connection between Isaiah 53 and Jesus.

The difficulty is that the particular verses as quoted bear no clear reference to execution apart from their context. To be sure, the last line, "For his life is taken up from the earth", seems to imply it. But this is no doubt due in large measure to the reader's knowledge of the context. The fact is that Luke could hardly have chosen two verses from this chapter that would more carefully avoid the subject than these. Unless, therefore, it is assumed that Luke intended the context to be understood--an assumption which, in the

---

1. Foakes-Jackson, BC, Vol. V, pp. 407-08.

light of the New Testament usage of Scripture elsewhere, is at least somewhat precarious--it will be the safer course not to count this passage in support of the item, "Crucified".[1] Likewise, there is nothing in this passage by itself that refers to Jesus' Messiahship. Therefore, it will not be counted for this item either.[2]

The answer to the third question as to the bearing of this passage on the proclamation of the "Universality of the Kerygma" is not so clear. There can be little question that Luke's telling of this story is meant to serve his theme concerning the gentile mission. Thus the purpose of the story itself is to proclaim the universality of the kerygma but whether this universality was a part of the actual preaching is another question. It may however be assumed that the very act of proclaiming the kerygma to the eunuch was an implicit declaration of its universality and since the story does not pretend to relate the content of Philip's conversation but only implies it, it may be reasonably assumed that the universality of the kerygma was present in it in this case.

The question of the occurrence of the item "Scriptures

---

1. For opposite point of view cf. Dodd, ATS, pp. 126, 132-33.

2. Note: The variant reading which includes the phrase, "Son of God", is not accepted in this study, following Eberhard Nestle's critical text of the Greek New Testament, 16th ed., (New York: American Bible Society, [1898] 1936), and the translators of the RSV.

Fulfilled" in Acts 10:43 is answered by the observation that the phrase, "to him all the prophets bear witness. . .", is simply a paraphrase of the proclamation that the Scriptures predicted his coming. This seems obvious enough to be allowed without further investigation.

The second question raised by this passage concerns the item, "Followed by the Holy Spirit". The problem here seems to be occasioned by Luke's method of writing. He relates that the Holy Spirit did indeed fall upon the company in Cornelius' house but he does not say that Peter had mentioned that possibility. It must however be assumed that Luke understood the gift of the Holy Spirit to be a part of Peter's message, otherwise he has created a situation which can hardly be intelligible. If the Holy Spirit had descended upon the company without their knowing anything about such a possibility, certainly some explanation would have been necessary. It seems, therefore, safe to assume that Luke intended the gift of the Holy Spirit to be a part of Peter's message.

The brief editorial passage, Acts 11:20, certainly presents the idea of the "Universality of the Kerygma" in action. Luke's reference to the preaching to the Greeks is for the purpose of presenting this idea. It may be safe to assume that such preaching would include a declaration that the gospel was intended also for the gentiles. On the

assumption that such was Luke's intention in this passage it will be included here.

The moral quality of Jesus' life which was explicitly proclaimed in Acts 10:38 seems to be alluded to again in Paul's speech in Acts 13:28. This, however, is not quite so certain. The point of the argument here is that Jesus was unjustly killed upon the request of the Jews. The phrase "nothing deserving death" refers more properly to his innocence of crimes that would justify his execution by Pilate rather than to his positive moral character. This item therefore will not be included in the survey.

A second question follows in this same passage as to whether there is a "Call to Repentance" involved. It seems clear enough that Luke intended such a call to be understood, for it is involved in a negative way in verses 38 to 40 by the statement that forgiveness of sins "is proclaimed to you" and the warning which follows against the danger of unbelief.

The "universality of the <u>kerygma</u>" seems to be quite definitely implied in Paul's speech at Lystra, Acts 14:15-17. For a Jew to preach to pagans that they are commanded to "turn from these vain things to a living God" must have entailed the explanation that that message was universal and so Luke appears to have implied.

Whether the Lordship of Jesus is indicated in Acts 14:21-23 hinges on the question, to whom does the word "Lord"

refer in the phrase, "To the Lord in whom they believed?" Luke uses the word Lord to refer to God and to Jesus indiscriminately throughout the book of Acts. So the question is to be determined by the context.

It seems most likely that Luke means to refer to Jesus in view of the fact that the phrase, "in whom they believed", definitely indicates the acceptance of apostolic preaching. The people referred to in these Galatian cities were undoubtedly Jewish and Gentile "God fearers", so that they could hardly have been converted to a belief in God as Lord, but rather must have accepted the belief in Jesus as Lord.

The whole sentence in verse 23 refers to the establishment of the converts in the new faith and therefore the new faith referred to by "Lord" must have concerned Jesus. It seems safe therefore to conclude that Luke is referring to the preaching of Jesus as Lord in this description of the reception of apostolic preaching.

The command to preach is definitely stated in Peter's speech before the apostles, Acts 15:7-11, but it is not clear from this passage that the command to preach was a part of the <u>kerygma</u>. This passage refers to the <u>kerygma</u> and its contents but is not an instance of it, therefore it provides no information as to whether this item was a part of the <u>kerygma</u>, and it will not be included in the survey.

The words, "the Dwelling of David", in Acts 15:13-21, raise the question as to whether Jesus' Davidic ancestry is

meant. It may be possible that this line refers to the reestablishment of the royal house of David. But it seems considerably more probable that this refers to the city of Jerusalem. At least, it is safer not to count this in the statistics.

In Acts 19:4 Paul is completing the unfinished or incomplete kerygma of John the Baptist to which he gives his obvious approval. John baptized in connection with the call to repentance. It seems clear that Paul recognizes and approves of this call to repentance. The dispute concerning the validity of John's baptism seems to indicate that it was a part of Paul's kerygma that one must be baptized in the Name of Jesus. It was at this point that Paul finds John's kerygma deficient. This passage which is concerned with the task--which occurs elsewhere in Acts--of placing John within the continuity of Christian preaching indicates that Luke understood John's message to be consonant with the preaching of the apostles except for certain omissions, one of which Paul is endeavouring to supply here. Therefore the items "Call to Repentance" and "Baptism" as parts of the kerygma received definite though indirect testimony in this passage.

Luke's interest in the gentile mission becomes evident again in Acts 19:26. The affinity of this passage with Acts 17:29 is obvious. In the latter, the "Universality of the Kerygma" is explicit. Following the line of reasoning used

in the same connection in the case of Acts 11:20, it seems proper to assume that Luke means to imply the same kind of argument here as in Acts 17:29f. It therefore will be counted as an instance of the "Universality of the Kerygma".

Paul's message to the elders at Miletus, Acts 20:18-35, as has already been pointed out, is included here because of the references it contains to Paul's previous preaching in Ephesus. Among these references seems to be the phrase, "to feed the church of the Lord which he obtains for himself with his own blood." The word "blood" is not uncommon as a reference to the cross and its connection therewith is obvious.[1] The question is, does he mean to say this was a part of his preaching? This seems to be probable because he has just said that, "I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole council of God". Weighing this passage in the light of Luke's emphases elsewhere, it seems safe to accept it as testimony to the place of the crucifixion in the kerygma.

That Paul bears witness to his "command to preach" to the Ephesian elders is clear enough from the words, "the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus". The

---

1. This follows the rendering of the RSV. There are both textual and translation difficulties here but this seems the most likely and accepted version. The alternative rendering noted in the RSV, "with the blood of his Own", if taken to refer to martyrs, would hardly suit the context of the book. Also, if the text be "the church of God", it could hardly follow that the reference is to God's blood. In any case, "blood" must refer to Jesus' death.

question whether this was a part of his original kerygma in Ephesus is impossible to determine. Therefore it will not be included in the survey.

It seems quite clear that Luke presupposes some ideas related in other speeches in his account of Paul's defense after his arrest in the temple at Jerusalem, Acts 22:1-21. Paul nowhere in this speech explains how Jesus could appear to him and yet the reader knows from previous speeches in the book that this presupposes the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus just as Luke makes Stephen a witness to the exaltation of Jesus by his reference to his vision of Jesus at the right hand of God in Acts 7:56. So here Paul is being made to testify to the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus by the experiences, which he relates, of seeing and hearing him. Since the value of these statistics is to indicate, by the frequency of reference, the emphasis Luke places on these various items, it is legitimate to count these indirect references to previous items, even though they are clear only by a knowledge of previous speeches, because in any case they indicate Luke's understanding of the emphasis in preaching.

The "Forgiveness of Sin" is a definite part of this kerygma though the phrase "wash away your sins" is actually a paraphrase of it. The "Call to Faith" is implicit here. The purpose of the speech as well as the reaction to it indicate that Luke understood it to be an invitation to

the hearers to accept the preaching of Paul about Jesus. Actually, every witness to the Messiahship of Jesus or the preaching about Jesus was an implicit call to faith, otherwise the declaration would have no point.

The question concerning the item, "Power of the Name", has already been dealt with in regard to this passage. See pp. 44, 49 above.

Quite aside from the difficulty of associating such an equivocation with Paul, Acts 23:6 raises the question of the connection between the general idea of the resurrection and the kerygma theme of the resurrection of Jesus. It may be argued--and it is undoubtedly true--that for the apostolic faith the resurrection of Jesus was the confirmation of the belief in the resurrection as a whole. But the question is, is that what is indicated here?

It seems most probable that Luke was simply trying to show, in the course of his story of Paul's arrest and subsequent trials, how cleverly Paul escaped the violence of the mob. Therefore, there is actually no information to be gained from this verse as to the content of the kerygma. It does however indicate Luke's prepossession with the idea of the resurrection, which shows itself elsewhere in his account of apostolic preaching. The passage, therefore, will be included in the chart though it supplies no example of a definite kerygma item and will not be counted in this summary.

There appears to be an element of the same kind of clever equivocation indicated in Luke's account of Paul's defense before the governor in Acts 24:10-21. That is to say, Luke is representing Paul as claiming to be a good and loyal Jew. He does however admit that "according to the way, which they call a sect, I worship the God of our fathers." Therefore it appears that he is indicating his belief in his defense and probably witnessing to what he has preached.

The point here is that his testimony to his belief in everything "laid down by the law or written in the prophets" indicates that Paul (according to Acts) considers the beliefs and ideas of this sect to be the fulfillment of that which is "written in the prophets". The veiled character of this reference is quite properly to be understood as Luke's attempt to represent Paul cleverly minimizing the lines of cleavage between the Jews and those of "the Way". The inference is nevertheless present that "the Way" is actually the fulfillment of that which is written in the prophets and laid down by the law. It therefore will serve to illustrate the emphasis on the continuity between the prophets and the gospel.

The question of the resurrection in this passage is very similar to that in connection with Acts 23:6 above. There is no specific allusion to Jesus here but rather an affirmation in the general hope of the resurrection. Al-

though undoubtedly behind this there is in Luke's mind the confirming fact of the resurrection of Jesus it is not explicit here and will not be so counted.

Likewise the idea of judgment, and quite possibly the place of Jesus as judge, lies back of the statement "there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust" yet it is not explicit and will not be counted, though its place in the chart is justified by its indication of the prominence of these themes in the book of Acts.

The next question concerns the occurrence of the "Exaltation" of Jesus in Paul's defense in Acts 26:2-27. The resurrection of Jesus is here clearly expressed. The exaltation and resurrection are intimately associated and probably should not be distinguished too sharply as ideas. They are, however, distinguished in the speeches of Acts and have therefore been so treated in this study. It will be shown later that there was a definite reason for this distinction. It is quite likely that Luke intended the exaltation to be understood in the same manner as in the case of Stephen's speech. That is to say, Jesus appeared to Paul as the exalted Lord "at the right hand of God" and it will therefore be so counted.

The question of the presence of the item "Followed by the Holy Spirit" concerns the phrase, "the help that comes from God". The Holy Spirit in the New Testament is not a dogmatic description of the Holy Trinity but rather de-

scribes the active presence of God.[1] As was pointed out above, Luke uses the term, "Holy Spirit", in a technical sense to stand for certain activities of God within the Christian community yet he does not hesitate to paraphrase even this term. It seems clear that the kind of relationship referred to here is the same as that which is elsewhere called the Holy Spirit by Luke and therefore it will be included in this survey.

The question concerning the item "Power of the Name" has already been dealt with in regard to this passage.

The Pauline letters present a difficulty for this type of analysis that is not so noticeable in Acts. The latter has a self-conscious historical interest and purpose, while in the former, the allusions to preaching are made incidentally in the course of arguments along quite different lines. It is, consequently, frequently difficult to tell exactly where Paul's reference to his previous preaching leaves off and his present argument is taken up. The difficulty is not so much in determining what was in Paul's <u>kerygma</u> as in determining the emphasis by the frequency of the various items. Furthermore, there may not be a great degree of correspondence between the frequency of an item in Paul's actual preaching and the frequency of his later

---

1. See the writer's thesis, <u>Paul's Use of the Word, Pneuma</u>, for the Bachelor of Divinity Degree, Andover Newton Theological School, 1949.

allusion to it in the letters. The attempt to find the emphasis by this means, however, is justified by the assumption that what he alludes to most frequently is indicated thereby to be what he judges, at the time of his writing, at least, to be most crucial.

Frequently, the explicit reference to kerygma content is so incomplete and its connection with the context so intimate that other items in that context are justifiably included as kerygma by inference. It is, nevertheless, wise for the sake of the strength of this type of evidence to incline toward a minimum of such inferences.

That Paul means to indicate "Jesus as Judge" in Romans 2:16 seems clear enough even though he speaks of God as judging because of his use of διά with the genitive, which in this case indicates agency. This is entirely in accord with apocalyptic thought which conceives the messiah as the agency or means of God's judgment. That is to say, God is the ultimate judge but appoints the messiah to perform the actual judgment. This kind of thinking is indicated in Acts 17, where Paul in his speech on Mars Hill speaks of God judging the world "by a man whom he has appointed" (lit. "in a man"). In Acts 10:42 Jesus is appointed by God "to be judge of the living and the dead". In all these cases the idea is that Jesus' function as judge is based on a delegated authority. Therefore, God is the ultimate judge but

Jesus is the one through whom that judgment is expressed. So here.

That Paul is claiming the "Command to Preach" in the context of Romans 10:17 is clear enough. The question is does he indicate that this is a part of the actual preaching. This cannot be determined in this passage. That Paul believes men cannot preach unless they are sent is explicitly stated in Romans 10:15. But that men proclaim that they have been commanded to preach, while it may be reasonably assumed, is not so stated here. Therefore, this item will not be counted. It is however included in the chart to indicate the thinking of Paul on the matter.

In Romans 15:19 the question is raised as to whether the Holy Spirit is indicated as a part of the kerygma. Paul is here saying that he has won obedience from the Gentiles, among other things, by "the power of the Holy Spirit". But it does not necessarily follow that he proclaims the gift of the Holy Spirit as following on belief in Christ (and baptism) as is the case in Acts. The question is not whether he believes in this idea as it appears in Acts but whether he preached it and there is no evidence here in either direction.

Similarly in Romans 16:26 it is quite clear that Paul understands his preaching activity as under the mandate of God but it is not clear that he included this mandate as a

part of the actual message. Therefore it will not be so counted.

In I Corinthians 1:17 it is evident from "the word of the cross" that the "Crucifixion" is to be taken as a part of the gospel. Indeed, here it seems to be the center of the gospel as Paul preached it.

This same passage also raises the question as to whether the "Command to Preach" is included in the kerygma. It seems likely that since he so frequently and so explicitly states in his letters that he was commanded to preach he probably included this idea in his preaching too but nothing in these passages justifies seeing this as any more than a likely guess. Therefore this item will not be counted here either.

In I Corinthians 1:23 and 24 Paul does not explicitly say that he preached salvation through Christ yet the indirect and incidental nature of his reference to his preaching here seems to justify the inclusion of this item in this passage. He has just mentioned in verse 21 the fact that "it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe". He follows then by saying "we preach Christ crucified". It seems obvious enough that what he means to say is that he preached Christ crucified as the means of God's salvation, therefore, the item, "Salvation" will be counted here.

In I Corinthians 2:2-5, Paul is making such indirect

and incidental reference to his preaching that it is difficult to tell just how much he means to say was included in his preaching to the Corinthians. He does, however, make it clear that the purpose of his knowing "nothing among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified" was that "your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God". One could hardly imagine that Paul had not invited them to place their faith in Jesus Christ if that was his purpose in preaching. The inference seems clearly justified.

The problem in the study of Paul's own witness to his preaching is particularly acute in the case of II Corinthians 4:4-14. Here he is obviously referring to his preaching but exactly how much of what he is saying he means to indicate was in his preaching is very difficult to tell. It seems clear however that the connection between verses 13 and 14 justifies the assumption that he is reminding the Corinthians of his preaching of the resurrection. The question follows, does this mean that he included the crucifixion? Nothing is said here of the crucifixion but the resurrection would hardly be mentioned in any sermon without at least making clear to the congregation that it was occasioned by the crucifixion. It seems obvious, therefore, that, if Paul says that he preached the resurrection, one is justified in concluding that Paul expects it to be understood that he also preached the crucifixion in the same connection. The difficulty of preaching about the resurrection without the

crucifixion seems to justify the inclusion of the crucifixion in this allusion to the kerygma.

Verse 5 in this passage seems to be rather clear on the point that the command to preach belonged in Paul's kerygma especially from the words "For what we preach is. . . Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake". It seems quite likely that the words, "for Jesus' sake", carry more the idea of obedience to the will of Jesus than merely speaking in His behalf.

That the item, "Forgiveness of Sins", was intended by Paul in II Corinthians 5:19 may be safely inferred from the connection he makes between "the message of reconciliation" and "not counting their trespasses against them." This latter phrase is obviously a paraphrase of the proclamation of forgiveness of sins, which according to this verse comprises at least part of the reconciliation.

At first reading the idea of the exalted Christ seems implicit in Colossians 1:45. But the fact that apocalyptic thought could use this same expression in connection with the final consummation of eschatological events without any reference to a present exaltation makes this passage questionable at this point. The probabilities are that Paul was thinking in terms of the exaltation but the passage is not explicit enough to justify its use in this connection.

That the "Call to Faith" was implied by Paul to be a part of his preaching in Colossians 1:21-23 may safely be

assumed on the basis of his exhortation to "continue in the faith" the opposite of which would be "shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard". It seems clear enough that he is challenging them to continue in the faith to which they had been called in the gospel.

In Colossians 2:6-15 the whole description of the conversion of the Colossians seems to indicate content of the preaching which occasioned that conversion. Therefore it appears legitimate to derive the contents of that sermon from this passage. Although the crucifixion is not stated explicitly, the reference to "God who raised him from the dead" implies it clearly enough to justify the assumption that it was in the sermon referred to.

"You were buried with him in baptism" is a part of the parallel Paul is drawing between the passion of Jesus and the believer's mystical experience. That he is referring to the actual passion story here admits of no doubt. And it is sufficiently probable that he is referring his Colossian readers to his kerygma in this passage. Therefore, this may be counted as an instance of the item, "Buried", in Paul's kerygma.

Whether the formula in I Timothy 3:16 is in fact kerygma[1], the phrase, "preached among the nations" must certainly be taken to refer to more than the pronoun, "He".

---

1. See above, p. 27f.

If He was so proclaimed, undoubtedly those responsible for the formula understood that the rest of the predicates were also proclaimed in the same manner. The phrase, therefore, connects this formula with the kerygma, whatever its actual function in the community may have been.

The question is raised in the chart as to whether the "Command to Preach" is implied in this formula. It seems safe enough to assume, in the light of the fact that the preaching is listed as a part of the "mystery" and therefore part of the divine plan, that those using this formula believed that preaching was commanded but there is no indication here that this belief was expressed in the kerygma itself. For that reason the item will not be counted.

The frequent reference to the gospel in II Timothy 1:8-12, especially the phrase, "for this gospel", makes it clear that what is under discussion is the content of the gospel. Therefore it appears legitimate to count this passage as testimony to the content of the kerygma. The question is raised by the phrase, "the grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus ages ago", whether an allusion to the fulfillment of Scriptures is in evidence here. As has already been observed the essential point in the item "Scriptures Fulfilled" is the establishment of a connection with an authoritative past. While the phrase under question is not an actual reference to prophetic fulfillment, it has

essentially the same function, namely, that of showing Jesus' coming to be the fulfillment of God's eternal purpose.

The most prominent way in which this idea was established in the New Testament was by demonstrating that Jesus was the fulfillment of numerous prophecies adduced from the Old Testament. This is quite likely what was in the mind of the writer here though it is not so stated. In any case this passage definitely belongs in the list of the content of the kerygma as alluding to "Background Anticipating Jesus", and rather than to create a special category for it, it will be sufficient to include it as an example of the item "Scriptures Fulfilled".

The ambiguity that has been noted before[1] with regard to the use of the word "Lord" is present here. It seems likely, however, in view of the content of the passage, that what is being advised is an unashamed preaching of the Lord, that is, "our Saviour Christ Jesus". "The gospel" throughout this passage is associated with Christ Jesus and "testifying to our Lord" is in apposition to the gospel, therefore, there appears to be an incidental attestation of the claim of Lordship for Jesus.

The next question raised by this passage is more difficult and concerns the meaning of the word "Day" in the

---

1. See above. p. 53f.

phrase "I am sure that he is able to guard until that Day". Two questions are raised: 1. Is this "Day" the parousia, or is it simply a reference to immortality and the judgment that awaits each individual beyond this life? 2. Is this to be taken as a part of the gospel for which the writer "was appointed a preacher and apostle and teacher"?

The impossibility of establishing with any assurance the answer to the second question on the basis of the wording in this passage would seem to advise against its use in this survey even though the phrase "all who have loved his appearing" in 4:8 would seem to justify the assumption that the repeated use of "that Day" in this book actually refers to a formal hope or belief in the parousia. Because of the difficulty in determining the connection between this phrase and the gospel, this item will not be counted.

The item "Kingdom of God" is questioned in the passage II Timothy 2:2-13. The phrase involved is, "If we endure, we shall also reign with him". This in all probability should be counted as established because quite obviously the phrase "reign with him" refers to the eschatological hope of the messianic rule which is commonly referred to in the New Testament as the kingdom of God. This item must be included in the category of his eschatological role and the "Kingdom of God" seems to be the proper place to list it.

Two questions are raised in connection with I Peter 1:10-12. The first is the question of the meaning of the

phrase "the subsequent glory". In all probability this is a reference to the exaltation for it does not refer to the future in which case it would be taken to mean the parousia. Since it follows immediately on a reference to the suffering of Christ it most probably refers to the resurrection and exaltation; that is, the reversal of the humiliation of the cross. On the other hand the whole sentence is a description of the point of view of the ancient prophets for whom not only the parousia but the first advent and crucifixion were future. It is possible therefore that it does refer to the parousia. However, the next sentence seems to make it clear that the sufferings and subsequent glory which the prophets had predicted "have now been announced" therefore the word glory will be taken to refer to the idea of the exaltation.

The second question concerning the "Command to Preach" involves the association of the Holy Spirit "sent from heaven" with the preaching of the good news. This could mean simply that the insight and power through which the preaching was accomplished was provided by the Holy Spirit. But it seems likely there was also understood to be a compulsion provided by the Holy Spirit which irresistibly caused the apostles to preach. That this compulsion was included as a part of the message however is not at all clear so this item will not be counted. Chart III contains the complete evidence--except the Synoptic material--upon

CATEGORIES	ITEMS / PASSAGES	ACTS 2:14-40 *	ACTS 3:12-26 *	ACTS 4:1-2	ACTS 4:8-12 *	ACTS 4:24-30	ACTS 4:33-35	ACTS 5:20-42 *	ACTS 6:12-14	ACTS 7:1-60 *	ACTS 8:5,12	ACTS 8:31-37	ACTS 9:19-22	ACTS 10:34-43 *	ACTS 11:20	ACTS 13:16-46 *	ACTS 14:15-17 *	ACTS 14:21-23	ACTS 15:7-11	ACTS 15:13-21	ACTS 16:31 *	ACTS 17:2-3,7	ACTS 17:22-31 *	ACTS 18:5	ACTS 18:28	ACTS 19:4	ACTS 19:8	ACTS 19:26	ACTS 20:18-35	ACTS 22:1-21 *	ACTS 23:6	ACTS 24:10-21 *	ACTS 24:24-25	ACTS 25:19	ACTS 26:2-27 *	ACTS 28:17-28
BACKGROUND ANTICIPATING JESUS	* SCRIPTURES FULFILLED	x	x			x				x		x		?		x				x		x			x							?			x	x
	* APPEAL TO NATURAL REASON																x						x					x					x			
	** EARLY HEBREW HISTORY									x						x																				
	* DAVIDIC DESCENT	x														x				(?)																
	* JOHN THE BAPTIST									(?)				x		x										x										
HIS MESSIANIC CHARACTER	* MESSIAHSHIP	x	x		x	x		x			x	(?)	x	x								x		x	x				x				x		x	
	* LORDSHIP	x					x			x				x	x			?	x		x								x	x					x	
	** JUST ONE																													x						
	* SERVANT		x			x																														
	** HOLY OR RIGHTEOUS ONE	x	x							x						x														x						
	** AUTHOR OF LIFE		x																																	
	* SON OF GOD												x			x																				
	** SON OF MAN									x																										
	* SAVIOUR							x																												
	LIKENESS OF GOD																																			
	KING																					x														
HIS LIFE HISTORY	* GOOD LIFE	x	x											x		(?)																				
	* CRUCIFIED	x	x		x	?		x		x		(?)		x		x						x							?					x	x	
	* BURIED	x														x																				
	* RESURRECTED	x	x	?	x		x							x		x						x	x							?	(?)	(?)		x	x	
	* EXALTED	x	?					x		x																				?					?	
HIS EFFECT ON BELIEVERS	* FOLLOWED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT	x	(?)			(?)		x						?					x																?	
	* POWER OF THE NAME		x		x	x		?			?			x																?					?	
	* FORGIVENESS OF SINS	x	?					x						x		x														?					x	
HIS ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE	* SALVATION	x			x											x			x		x															x
	* ETERNAL LIFE															x																				
	* PAROUSIA		?						?																											
	* JESUS AS JUDGE													x									x									(?)				
	KINGDOM OF GOD										x							x									x		x							x
	MYSTERY																																			
	* COMING DISASTER	?																															x			
THE APPEAL	* CALL TO REPENTANCE	x	x					?								?	x						x			?			x						x	
	* BAPTISM	x									x	x		x												?				x						
	* CALL TO FAITH		x								x	x		x		x		x	x		x					x			x	?			x		x	x
HIS COSMIC SIGNIFICANCE	* UNIVERSALITY OF THE KERYGMA											?		x	?		?		x		x		x					?		x					x	
	* COMMAND TO PREACH	?						x						x		x			(?)										?	x					x	x

CATEGORIES	ITEMS / PASSAGES	ROM. 1:1-6 *	ROM. 1:16	ROM. 2:16	ROM. 10:8-9	ROM. 10:17	ROM. 15:19	ROM. 16:25-26	I COR. 1:17-18	I COR. 1:23-24	I COR. 2:2-5	I COR. 15:1-15 *	II COR. 1:18-19	II COR. 4:4-14	II COR. 5:11-21	GAL. 2:14-21	GAL. 3:1	EPH. 3:8-12	EPH. 6:19	PHIL. 1:18	COL. 1:4-5	COL. 1:21-23	COL. 2:6-15	I THESS. 1:5	I THESS. 1:9-10	I THESS. 2:13-15	I TIM. 3:16	II TIM. 1:8-12	II TIM. 2:2-13	TITUS 1:1-3	I PET. 1:10-12
BACKGROUND ANTICIPATING JESUS	* SCRIPTURES FULFILLED	x						x				x																?		x	x
	* APPEAL TO NATURAL REASON							x										x													
	** EARLY HEBREW HISTORY																														
	* DAVIDIC DESCENT	x																											x		
	* JOHN THE BAPTIST																														
HIS MESSIANIC CHARACTER	* MESSIAHSHIP	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x			x		x	x		x
	* LORDSHIP	x			x									x				x					x			x		?			
	** JUST ONE																														
	* SERVANT																														
	** HOLY OR RIGHTEOUS ONE																														
	** AUTHOR OF LIFE																														
	* SON OF GOD	x											x												x						
	** SON OF MAN																														
	* SAVIOUR																											x		x	
	LIKENESS OF GOD													x																	
	KING																														
HIS LIFE HISTORY	* GOOD LIFE														x																
	* CRUCIFIED								?	x	x	x		?	x		x					x	?			x		x	x		x
	* BURIED											x											?								
	* RESURRECTED	x			x							x		x	x								x		x				x		
	* EXALTED																				(?)						x				?
HIS EFFECT ON BELIEVERS	* FOLLOWED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT						(?)				x													x							x
	* POWER OF THE NAME	x																													
	* FORGIVENESS OF SINS														?								x								
HIS ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE	* SALVATION		x		x				x	?		x																x			x
	* ETERNAL LIFE																													x	
	* PAROUSIA																								x			(?)			
	* JESUS AS JUDGE			?																											
	KINGDOM OF GOD																												?		
	MYSTERY							x										x	x									x			
	* COMING DISASTER								x																x						
THE APPEAL	* CALL TO REPENTANCE														x																
	* BAPTISM																						x								
	* CALL TO FAITH	x	x		x	x		x			?	x		x		x		x				?				x	x			x	
HIS COSMIC SIGNIFICANCE	* UNIVERSALITY OF THE KERYGMA																										x				
	* COMMAND TO PREACH	x				(?)		(?)	(?)					?	x			x									(?)	x		x	(?)

CHART III. SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS IN ALL EVIDENCE AND CATEGORIES

* SPECIFIC ACCOUNTS OF THE KERYGMA AND ITEMS APPEARING THEREIN.
** ITEMS APPEARING ONLY IN SPECIFIC ACCOUNTS.
(?) NOT COUNTED IN THE STATISTICS.

which this study is based with indications of the categories into which it is divided and the results of the discussion in this section.

2. Summary of Statistical Evidence

It is now time to summarize the results of the evidence as it is represented in Chart III. The statistics in the following table are conveniently divided into three categories. The first category is simply the grand total of the appearances of the items in all the passages. The second of these follows the classification used in the previous chapter based on the nature of the passages themselves, i.e., direct and indirect reference to kerygma content. The third is based upon the authorship or writing within which the passages are found, i. e., Acts (Luke?), Pauline Epistles, later Epistles.

TABLE I.
Showing Percentage of Frequency of Items

ITEM	GRAND TOTAL	DIRECT	INDIRECT	ACTS	PAUL	LATER
Total number of passages	65	15	50	35	25	5
Scriptures Fulfilled	29%	60%	20%	37%	12%	60%
Appeal to Natural Reason	9%	13%	8%	11%	8%	--
Early Hebrew History	3%	13%	--	6%	--	--
Davidic Descent	6%	13%	4%	6%	4%	20%
John the Baptist	3%	13%	--	6%	--	--
Messiahship	57%	53%	58%	40%	76%	80%
King	2%	--	--	3%	--	--
Lordship	28%	46%	22%	31%	24%	20%
Just One	2%	7%	--	3%	--	--
Servant	3%	7%	2%	6%	--	--
Holy or Righteous One	8%	--	10%	14%	--	--
Author of Life	2%	7%	--	3%	--	--
Son of God	9%	13%	8%	9%	12%	--
Son of Man	2%	7%	--	3%	--	--
Saviour	5%	7%	4%	3%	--	40%
Likeness of God	2%	--	2%	--	4%	--
Good Life	6%	20%	2%	9%	4%	--
Crucified	38%	60%	34%	37%	80%	60%
Buried	6%	20%	2%	6%	8%	--
Resurrected	31%	67%	20%	37%	40%	20%
Exalted	12%	40%	4%	17%	--	40%
Followed by the Holy Spirit	14%	33%	8%	14%	24%	20%
Power of the Name	14%	47%	4%	23%	4%	--
Forgiveness of Sins	14%	47%	4%	20%	8%	--
Salvation	20%	33%	16%	17%	20%	40%
Eternal Life	3%	7%	2%	3%	--	20%
<u>Parousia</u>	5%	7%	2%	6%	4%	--
Jesus as Judge	5%	13%	2%	6%	4%	--
Kingdom of God	9%	--	12%	14%	--	20%
Mystery	6%	--	8%	--	12%	20%
Coming Disaster	6%	7%	6%	6%	8%	--
Call to Repentance	15%	47%	6%	26%	4%	--
Baptism	11%	20%	8%	17%	4%	--
Call to Faith	43%	53%	40%	40%	48%	40%
Universality of <u>Kerygma</u>	17%	40%	10%	29%	--	20%
Command to Preach	20%	47%	12%	20%	16%	40%

It is apparent upon reading over the list of items in the above table that certain of them bear affinities which allow them to be grouped together and treated as units in a larger body of ideas. It is clear, for instance, that the items "Scriptures Fulfilled" and "Early Hebrew History" both represent attempts to associate the advent of Jesus with a religiously authoritative past. The idea is that Jesus is the culmination of God's purposive activity in and through Israel.[1] This idea is, of course, closely associated with the belief in His Messiahship.

It is not difficult to see that the claim of Davidic ancestry for Jesus and the place in the program assigned to John the Baptist are also a part of this same idea. The reasoning back of the passages entitled "Appeal to Natural Reason" is of the same kind. The advent of Jesus is not some entirely new thing but occupies the climactic place in God's dealings with the world which have been previously known through natural providence. All these items, therefore, concern themselves with the same general theme, the "Background Anticipating Jesus".

As was indicated in Chapter II[2], the various titles applied to Jesus have been listed separately in the charts. Since they all partake of a messianic character, they must be considered together as a single category.

---

1. This matter will be treated more fully later.

2. See p. 17.

To avoid shifting the basis of division, the various references to events in Jesus' life should undoubtedly be grouped in one category in spite of the temptation offered by the formula-like pattern that appears with comparative frequency referring to Jesus' crucifixion, burial, and resurrection. As important as these items are to the kerygma, it may be seen by a glance at the above table that they do not dominate it to an extent that would justify individual treatment in the following table. They are of significance, in other words, because, taken together, they play a significant role in a larger pattern.

The next several items deal with the consequences that follow on the claims made for Jesus. They all deal with the effect and significance of His advent, but they may conveniently and justifiably be divided into two categories. The first should include those items which refer to the immediate effect of Jesus upon the repentant believer. This includes the gift of the Holy Spirit and other phenomena induced by the power of Jesus' Name, including especially and inevitably the forgiveness of the believer's sins.

The remaining items dealing with the consequences of the advent of Jesus are more or less eschatological. "Salvation" and "Eternal Life" are perhaps less apocalyptic than the "Parousia", yet their reference is quite as much beyond the immediate, temporal sphere of life. The idea that the coming of Jesus somehow signaled the judgment of the world

belongs also to this vein of thought, as does Paul's repeated reference to the "Mystery" associated with Jesus. The idea of an impending tribulation or widespread punishment about to fall upon mankind finds expression several times in the *kerygma*. This too is clearly an eschatological idea. Since all of these items are associated with Jesus' advent, they are grouped in a category called "His Eschatological Role".

It may quite properly be assumed *a priori* that the *kerygma* always ended with an appeal for response on the part of the hearers. The fact that this appeal does not always appear in the evidence, especially in the indirect evidence, is no more than what should be expected. For the reason that this part of the *kerygma* was more likely to be taken for granted than the more or less unique features, and therefore omitted in the evidence, the comparative frequency or paucity of the various items in this category bear less significance than elsewhere. The fact is, however, that the three items, repentance, baptism, and faith in this category are so closely related as to make it antecedently possible, perhaps even probable, that they were all implicit in virtually every occasion of the *kerygma*.

There remain now two items which appear to have a definite place in the *kerygma* but which do not fit into any of the above categories. One is the proclamation that the gospel is for all men without regard to their relationship

to the Jewish Commonwealth. The other is the idea that the _kerygma_ is commanded. The preacher, in other words, states to his hearers that he has been commanded to proclaim the _kerygma_.

That these two items have an eschatological element is strongly to be suspected, but the point here is that they unite in giving expression to the belief that the advent of Jesus is a matter of universal significance. True, there may still be an elect community as in Jewish apocalyptic thought, but now the lines of cleavage cut across all traditional nationalistic and racial distinctions. Furthermore, the non-elect are quite as much involved as the elect in the coming Judgment by Jesus. Therefore the command to preach is based on the notion that the _kerygma_ is addressed to "all everywhere" (Acts 17:30) and must, consequently, be heard by all (Mt. 24:14). This may not be the sort of reasoning back of every instance of these two items, but the fact remains that they do stand related by the belief in the universality of Jesus' significance and the right of every man to hear the gospel.

The following table gives the statistics showing the frequency with which one or more of the items of each of these categories appears in the evidence. The latter are classified as in Table I above.

TABLE II.
Showing Percentage of Frequency of Categories

CATEGORY	GRAND TOTAL	DIRECT	INDIRECT	ACTS	PAUL	LATER
Total number of passages	65	15	50	35	25	5
Background	42%	73%	32%	51%	20%	80%
Messianic Character	72%	80%	70%	63%	84%	80%
Life History	51%	80%	42%	46%	52%	80%
Effect on Believers	28%	67%	16%	31%	24%	20%
Eschatological Role	45%	53%	42%	43%	40%	80%
The Appeal	52%	80%	44%	51%	56%	40%
Cosmic Significance	32%	67%	22%	40%	16%	60%

3. Evaluation of the Statistics

Four observations may be made at the outset concerning these statistics. The first is that, with a few exceptions, every reference to the kerygma concerns itself with Jesus. Typical of these exceptions is Acts 14:15-17. There is good reason for disregarding this passage in this connection. It has already been noted that Luke has a tendency to omit steps in his logic in one speech which are to be found in others.[1] If this is true of the logic of Old Testament exegesis, might it not be true of other phases of these speeches as well? Furthermore, this speech includes another motive beside that of the kerygma, namely, that of extricating Paul and Barnabas from the impossible situation in which they found themselves. The speech bears all the marks of having been contrived to embellish the narrative and therefore should hardly be allowed to count against the conclusion borne out by the bulk of the evidence, that the kerygma always concerned Jesus in one way or another.[2]

---

1. See above, p. 50.

2. Other passages which make no direct reference to Jesus are: Acts 15:13-21; 19:8, 26; 23:6; 24:10-21 (Cf., however, 24:24-25 and 25:19); Rom. 1:16; Eph. 6:19; I Thess. 1:5. In all these cases either the above argument applies or the context makes it clear that a reference to Jesus is presupposed.

The second observation follows on the first. There is no other item that appears with anything like the same consistency. The item which appears with the greatest frequency is the Messiahship of Jesus, but taken by itself this item appears in only slightly more than one-half of the passages.

To be sure, this is not an entirely accurate picture, because the various appellations in the list of items may be considered in some sense synonymous with messiahship. At least some of them stand in a closer relationship to one another than obtains between the items within the other categories. But even taking this into account, the number of passages containing one or another of these appellations is very little more than two-thirds of the total evidence. This matter will be taken up again a little later but at this point it is worthy of note that there is no item in the *kerygma* that is to be found in every occurrence of the evidence.[1]

On the other hand, it is to be observed in the third place, that while many of the items occur only a few times and in such a way as to suggest that the *kerygma* was actually quite varied and, as should be expected, was adapted to the various circumstances, there are a few items which stand out in Table I, especially in the Grand Total column, because of

---

1. T. F. Glasson, in a recent article writes, "It is therefore a sound rule to attach most importance to those

their greater frequency. At the same time the wide variation disappears when the items are grouped into categories in Table II, while the three highest categories are the ones which contain four of the items occurring with significantly greater frequency. There is, therefore, a certain consistency in the greater frequency of these items. They are : 1. The Messiahship; 2. The crucifixion; 3. The resurrection; 4. The call to faith. Of these the Messiahship of Jesus[1] is by far the most dominant.

A fourth observation that may be worthy of note is that there are only four items which appear only in the indirect evidence: Likeness of God, King, Kingdom of God, mystery. Of these four, the first two are clearly messianic titles similar to those appearing in the direct evidence, the third expresses an idea quite consonant with other items in its

---

items which appear every time and not to include in the essential Kerygma those which only have occasional mention." There are at least two strong objections which can be urged against this rule. In the first place, there are no such items unless they are produced by arbitrarily reducing the evidence. This would mean eliminating all but the formula-like passages in Acts and the two famous ones in Paul. Actually, there is good *a priori* reason for pursuing exactly the opposite course and giving the greater weight to the incidental and fragmentary references. In the second place, such a procedure inevitably assigns a greater importance to the Acts speeches than many scholars would be inclined to give them. (See above, p. 8). See Glasson, Art. (1953), p. 129.

1. "Scriptures Fulfilled", occurring nineteen times might be included here. But its obvious apologetic and interpretive role seems to warrant its omission at this point.

category, and the last appears to be a term peculiar to Paul which in reality adds nothing new to the kerygma.

There are only five items which do not appear in the indirect evidence: Early Hebrew History, Just One, Holy or Righteous One, Son of Man, Author of Life. The first of these is of such a nature that it would be unlikely to expect it to appear in indirect references. The last four, like the first two listed only in the indirect evidence, are messianic titles. An examination of the passages within which more than one of these titles appear will show that their presence or absence in a particular strand of evidence is of little significance.

It is apparent, therefore, that the direct and the indirect evidence corroborate each other to a remarkable degree. This should indicate the reliability, in general, of the total evidence.

Two generalizations are warranted at this point which bear heavily on the conclusions of this chapter as to the nature of the kerygma in the New Testament. One is that it is by no means stereotyped, but rather manifests a considerable variety of expression. The other generalization is that, in spite of the manifest variety, certain patterns of ideas are discernible around which the various items of the

kerygma naturally group themselves. The categories in Table II above are an attempt to demonstrate that pattern.

It is only by means of this pattern that a coherent view of the kerygma may be had. An examination, therefore, of the categories--assuming that they adequately represent the pattern--will not only reveal the nature of the kerygma but should also lead to an understanding of the logical sequence of ideas by which its inner history may be reconstructed.

4. The Synoptic Evidence

Before proceeding to a discussion of the nature of the kerygma, the Gospel material must be examined for whatever light it can shed on the content of the kerygma. It must be acknowledged at the outset that this can be no more than an indirect light, based as it is on the assumption that either this tradition must have influenced the apostolic preaching or the apostolic preaching helped to shape and determine the tradition.

Undoubtedly, both assumptions are justified. It is hard to believe that the early Christians, while busying themselves with preaching about Jesus and preserving and developing the tradition about Him embodied in the Gospels, would fail to be consciously influenced by what they believed to be Jesus' own preaching (and that of John the Baptist).[1] Surely they believed themselves to be simply

---

1. Cf. Dodd, AP, p. 24.

carrying on the proclamation that Jesus had begun and had commissioned them to continue.

On the other hand, it is equally difficult to think that the early Christians could successfully resist the temptation to read back into that tradition their own experiences and developing thought. To the extent to which the latter is true, the Gospels provide a testimony to the nature of the kerygma of the most authentic kind. As has already been pointed out, the difficulty lies in determining the extent to which one or the other of these assumptions is right; also how and to what extent they influenced the kerygma.[1] It will be profitable, nevertheless, to observe the content of preaching in the Synoptic tradition.

Whether the tradition about the preaching of John the Baptist was brought into line with the apostolic message or is more or less accurate is not so important for the purposes of this study as is the fact that the Evangelists unite in placing John within the tradition as the herald of the Messiah and the precursor of the kerygma.[2] Matthew, in fact, introduces the preaching of John and Jesus in exactly the same words. (cf. Matt. 3:2 and 4:17).

As it stands in the Synoptic records, the preaching of John has a number of points of contact with the kerygma.

---

1. See p. 30ff.

2. See p. 31.

In fact, only at one point does it contain anything not corresponding to items in the kerygma, namely, in the practical ethical admonitions (Lk. 3:10-14). This latter element stands in the place at which is given a "Call to Faith" in apostolic preaching. But this does not necessarily indicate an actual difference. It must not be assumed, for lack of specific evidence, that there was no ethical instruction in the kerygma. The manifest ethical concern throughout the New Testament makes this very unlikely. There is a strong likelihood that, whatever else may have been read back into the tradition, this ethical message was a genuine recollection of John's preaching.

The rest of the tradition here falls quite naturally into the picture of the antecedent of the kerygma. There is the announcement of the kingdom of God, the coming messiah (The Synoptic writers find it unnecessary to have John identify him as the Fourth Gospel does. The reader knows who he is), the gift of the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, the coming judgment with its cataclysmic manifestations over which the messiah will preside, the call to repentance and baptism.[1] Luke's inclusion of an admonition to the soldiers seems to inject a note of universalism--espe-

---

1. Although there was a distinction drawn between John's baptism and that performed in the name of Jesus (Acts 19:4f), there can be little doubt that John's baptism was the antecedent of Christian baptism. Cf. Ropes, TAA, p. 198.

cially in conjunction with the saying about Abraham's children (Matt. 3:9 and Lk. 3:8).

Taken as a whole, this preaching and the kerygma bear a significant resemblance to one another.[1] If this is the result of a reading back into the tradition of early Christian practice, it provides strong testimony to the principal emphasis of the kerygma, especially as to its aim. If, on the other hand, it is considered to be an authentic tradition, it must have been influential at least as a model for Christian preaching. In any case, the tradition of John's preaching reenforces the evidence of the kerygma along its principal lines: the coming messiah and eschatological expectations are used as motives for repentance and baptism. The obvious sympathy with which this tradition is treated by the Synoptic writers reveals the respect in which it was held and the influence it must have had.[2]

There can be no doubt that at one time or another virtually all of the Synoptic material would be utilized by the early Christian preacher. For instance, Jesus' pronouncement of forgiveness of sins (Mk. 2:5 and parallels, and elsewhere) would justify that point in the kerygma. The

---

1. Note that, with the exception of an appeal to Old Testament prophecy, virtually all of the main categories of the kerygma appear in John's message that could well do so without too obvious anachronisms.

2. Note also, Acts 10:37; 13:24-25.

miracle stories would be the background of the proclamation of the "Power of the Name". The eschatological passages would be related to that category in the _kerygma_, and so on. The difficulty in establishing any specific connection between this material and the _kerygma_ makes it advisable to avoid the danger of begging the question by appealing to the former as evidence of _kerygma_ content.

Yet Jesus is said to have preached, and it will be worthwhile to note what the tradition concerning His preaching is. Specific statements concerning Jesus' preaching, as distinct from His teaching, are surprisingly few and well summed up in three passages: Matthew 4:17; Mark 1:14-15; Luke 4:14-27.

His message is simple: The time is fulfilled. The kingdom of God is at hand. Therefore, repent and believe. Luke adds a specific reference to the fulfilment of Scripture which was undoubtedly understood to be an announcement of His own Messiahship. There follows in Luke a rabbinical argument concerned with the failure of His fellow countrymen to receive His announcement. But it is not difficult to see in this argument the influence of Luke's interest in the gentile Mission. Such a tradition would lend powerful support to those who were occupied with proclaiming the _kerygma_ as universally applicable.

There are, of course, serious problems with regard to the integrity of the Lucan passage. But if this is viewed

as at least what second-generation Christianity held to be the preaching of Jesus, it can be safely argued that these passages are significant of the motif of early Church preaching. With their constant preoccupation with Jesus, the early preachers would most naturally appeal to what they believed to be His preaching as their guide and authority. In so far as this tradition was shaped, both by selection and expansion, by the Church, it reflects all the more the interests and practices of the latter. The significant point for this study is the fact that the motif of Jesus' preaching is essentially the same as that of John the Baptist: The eschatological hopes and the coming of the messiah are appealed to as motives for repentance.

The next block of Synoptic material relevant to this study concerns the mission of the disciples, Matthew 9:36-11:1; Mark 6:7-13; Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-16. Probably nowhere in the Synoptic Gospels is the composite and expanded character of the material more evident than here. Throughout these passages may be seen the influence of the experience of the early Christian evangelists.[1] Taken together, these passages might well be entitled, A Manual for the Christian Evangelist. This fact makes these passages of all the greater significance for the study of the kerygma.

Although the majority of this material is concerned

---

1. See Weizsäcker, TAA, Vol. I., p. 29, and Ropes, TAA, p. 40.

with the practical matters of conducting the mission, facing opposition and persecution, etc., there three items of the message are mentioned: The kingdom of God, repentance, and "confessing" Jesus. This last is probably to be understood in the same vein as the "Call to Faith" appearing so frequently in the kerygma. Again the same motif appears: Eschatological hopes are appealed to for the motivation of repentance.

The Matthean command to "go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"--whatever may have been its original import--need not be taken to indicate an anti-gentile bias at the time of the writing of this Gospel. In its setting, followed by warnings of rejection and persecution, and the judgment that awaits the cities that do not receive the apostles, it fits in very well with the policy of going "to the Jew first and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16) so clearly stated in Acts 28:25-28. What better argument could be advanced for the gentile mission than that Jesus had sent the apostles to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" but the latter had rejected their message? The words, "to bear testimony before them and the Gentiles", (Matt. 10:18) reenforce this reasoning. Although there is no direct reference to a gentile mission, this material forms a good background for it.

With Luke 24:46-47 (as well as with Matthew 28:18-20)

the Synoptic evidence for the kerygma enters the post-resurrection period. Actually, this passage might well be included in the statistical charts for it is manifestly of a piece with the Acts material. Since, however, it is in fact a part of the Synoptic material and adds nothing new to the post-resurrection evidence for the kerygma, it will be treated here. The most important contribution this passage makes is the claim of the explicit authority of Jesus for the post-resurrection kerygma. It therefore functions as a connecting link between the preaching of Jesus and the kerygma. It is highly significant that the center of the kerygma, according to this passage, is "repentance and forgiveness of sins" (vs. 47). This connects it with the preaching of Jesus himself as will be seen later. The departure from Jesus' preaching consists in the substitution of the Messiahship, death and resurrection of Jesus, fortified by Scriptural prediction, for the imminence of the Kingdom of God. It will be shown in the next chapter that this is significantly characteristic of the difference between the preaching of Jesus and that of the apostolic Church.

Finally, the "Charter of Foreign Missions",[1] Matthew 28:18-20, offers the most direct reference to apostolic preaching in the Synoptic Gospels. This passage can hardly

---

1. Major, MMJ, p. 250.

be taken as an original saying of Jesus but for that reason it stands closer to the practice and thinking of the early Church.

Judged by the rest of the material adduced in the course of this study, this passage belongs to the very latest strata of New Testament evidence for the kerygma. To be sure, this conclusion would not be consonant with the date generally assigned to Matthew. However, the possibility of later interpolation is not to be overlooked. The "Trinitarian formula" to be used in baptism, the absence of any mention of repentance or faith, the manifestly different attitude toward eschatology--more formal and less vivid, all indicate the spirit of an age considerably removed from the first fervid years of the Church.

Taken by itself, this passage allows little to be inferred as to the development of the kerygma, however, without the danger of begging the question since the very ideas from which that development must be inferred form the evidence for its late date. But when this passage is taken in the light of what can be known of the change of ideas from the rest of the New Testament, it may be permissible to observe that the dropping of eschatological motivation, the formalizing of baptism, the meaning of discipleship, and the eschatological hope, all conform to the kind of development that should be expected.

On the other hand, this passage would quite naturally

fortify the Christian evangelist's claim that he was commanded to preach, his appeal to his hearers to be baptized, his claim that the kerygma was universally applicable, and his proclamation of the Lordship or authority of Jesus. These items appear to have remained rather fixed in the changing kerygma.

With the exception of this last material the Synoptics present a simple but essentially unified motif in the kerygma: The imminence of the eschaton and the coming of the messiah are appealed to as motives for repentance and baptism. This motif will be of help in describing the nature of the kerygma.

5. The Nature of the Kerygma

In attempting a description of the nature of the kerygma, it must be borne in mind that the word "kerygma" is used as a collective noun. It has already been pointed out that there was no one kerygma. A glance at Chart I[1] will suffice to show that even in the "direct evidence" there is no completely consistent pattern of items which would justify postulating an apostolic formula[2] governing the preaching

---

1. See p. 15.

2. Dodd, AP, pp. 14, 25. Martin Dibelius (FTG, pp. 17-19) implied that the "formula" is confined to "the preaching of Jesus Christ" which "was contained in a few short sentences". These sentences he understands to include essentially a reference to the death, burial, resurrection, and appearances of Jesus. Dibelius restricts the

of the early Church. There seems to be little warrant for assuming the presence of items which are not actually mentioned in one speech simply because they occur in another.[1] It must be recognized that any general description of the <u>kerygma</u> based on an over-all view of the evidence is an abstraction and not a description of what was said on any given occasion.

Unless the greater frequency of some items in the evidence is charged completely to statistical accident, there are items which are more characteristic of the <u>kerygma</u> than others. These items will be important in the attempt to reconstruct its history.

It should also be noted that there are certain difficulties inherent in the statistical method of handling the evidence. Because of the very variety in the expressions in

---

word "kerygma" to this formula and describes the preaching as consisting of: "<u>Kerygma</u> or message, scriptural proof, exhortation to repentance." The "<u>kerygma</u>" here corresponds to what Dodd calls the "historical section of the <u>kerygma</u>". (Cf. AP, p. 47.) The difficulty is that, as may be seen in Charts I and III, this pattern doesn't occur with sufficient frequency when viewed in the light of the total evidence to justify calling it a formula. In fact, the concurrence of the crucifixion and resurrection which does occur with a significant frequency is probably not so much the result of a formula lying back of it as it is a natural result of a pattern forced upon the preachers by the inescapable historical facts with which they had <u>to</u> deal in preaching Jesus. This will come under full discussion in the next chapter.

1. To be sure, there are occasions in which the incompleteness of the evidence may imply certain other items, but each such case must be decided on its own merits.

the evidence it has become necessary from the beginning to group the items according to the ideas expressed in order to handle them in a systematic fashion. In the first place, this has obscured, at the outset, some of the variety that actually exists. In the second place, the items have been abstracted in the process from the setting within which the particular nuances of their meaning are to be discovered. At the important points, this disadvantage will be compensated for in the next chapter. In spite of these disadvantages, this method seems to be the best for providing a general picture of the kerygma and certain important facts from which this study must work.

A certain amount of selectivity must inevitably be exercised in classifying the items. It would make the material hopelessly unwieldy to include every statement and idea mentioned in reference to early Church preaching. It may be charged that the selection at points has been arbitrary. But the selection has attempted to collate the more stable, concrete items and at the same time avoid the phrases and clauses that are simply interpretive. For instance, Dodd cites the phrase, "for our sins" (I Cor. 15:3), as an item peculiar to Paul's kerygma.[1] This has not been included as a separate item here but rather subsumed under "crucified". It is simply an interpretation of the

---

1. Dodd, AP, p. 25.

significance of the crucifixion. It will be the aim of the next chapter to study these evidences of a growing system of interpretation in the kerygma.

T. F. Glasson contends that one of the items that should be included in a description of the kerygma is "we are witnesses" (Acts 2:32; 3:15; etc.).[1] But this is only by way of confirmation of the truth of certain statements made in the course of the sermon. Furthermore this statement would of necessity be limited to the original Jerusalem Christians and it is hardly to be supposed that they were the only proclaimers of the kerygma. A correlative of this was the affirmation that the gift of the Holy Spirit was a verification of the truth of the kerygma (Acts 5:32). The questionable authenticity of these Acts speeches would seem to warrant the conclusion that the phrase, "we are witnesses", and other like phrases are simply a literary device to provide the speeches with historical verisimilitude. At best it affirms only that there were those in the original community who had witnessed the historical facts related in the kerygma. The quite incidental remark, "as you yourselves know" (Acts 2:22), would have as much claim as this to a place in the kerygma.

A careful reading of the passages adduced in this study[2]

---

1. Glasson, Art.(1953).

2. See Chapter II., pp. 10-29.

will reveal many more such statements, some of which will find a place in the discussion in the next chapter.

Mention should probably be made of one such statement here. It is the nearest to a reference to the Church in the *kerygma* evidence.[1] The phrase runs: "that they may receive . . . a place among those who are consecrated by faith in me" (Acts 26:18). It is remarkable to note the absence of any allusion to the Church in definite connection with apostolic preaching. The preacher never invites the hearers to become a part of the Church although interest in and reference to the Church are abundant throughout the material within which the *kerygma* evidence is found.

The inference is not difficult to draw, especially from the earlier speeches in Acts, that the *kerygma* was addressed to Israel as such and no separate organization was foreseen as the result of such preaching. The statement, "God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Savior, to give repentance to Israel . . ." (Acts 5:31; cf. also 13:16,26) seems to indicate this. Later, the hostility of the Jews precipitated the formation of the Church. Since this has *a priori* probability of being true, Luke may well be indi-

---

1. There are, of course, several allusions to the Church in connection with the references to the *kerygma* in the passages herein adduced but nothing is said in these cases to indicate definitely that these allusions formed part of the kerygma. Cf. Acts 20:28; I Cor. 15:9; Eph. 3:10; I Thess. 2:14. It is interesting to note that all these references are connected with Paul.

cating in this instance a significant measure of dependability in his description of the kerygma.

Probably the best view of the kerygma can be had by beginning with its aim. The motif discovered in the Synoptics in the previous section would certainly set this aim as a motivation to repentance and establishing of a new ethical relationship with God. This aim is apparent in "The Appeal", especially in Acts.[1] In Acts 3:19-20, the parousia appears to be contingent upon such repentance. In any case, the items in the kerygma appear to be adduced for the purpose of providing ethical motivation. Thus it would seem that the basic motif of the Synoptics is followed in the Acts accounts of the kerygma.

If this is true, then the various items are not offered as articles of faith or "saving facts"[2] to be believed but, quite the reverse, as a series of postulates in an argument built up to induce a course of action. This is clearly evident in such statements as, "you yourselves know" (Acts 2:22) and, "For the king knows about these things" (Acts 26:26). The argument of the kerygma starts with certain beliefs accepted in common by preacher and hearers, then proceeds to establish the truth of certain other beliefs upon the basis of which the appeal for repentance is made. It is

1. Cf. Dodd, AP, p. 23f.

2. Cf. Dodd, AP, p. 42.

in the various forms this process has taken that a clue to the history of the kerygma is to be found.

The marked similarity between the creed and certain of the formula-like descriptions of the kerygma is well known[1] (cf. Rom. 1:1-6; I Cor. 15:1-7). The relation between the two, however, should not be construed to imply that the kerygma was offered as a sort of primitive creed. It appears safe to say that what was assumed in the kerygma as a basis for argument became in the creed an article of faith to be believed. The aim, in other words, had gradually shifted, or at least the method had changed. The items, therefore, in the kerygma are to be evaluated in the light of its manifest aim.

It may be instructive to observe the themes ascribed to the kerygma in the editorial passages in Acts.[2] Here is found Luke's incidental estimate of the subjects of the kerygma. By far the most prominent among these is the Messiahship of Jesus, which occurs in six of the eleven passages. Jesus is proclaimed as Lord in three passages, two of which do not mention Jesus as the Messiah. If "Lord" can be considered a messianic title, as it is herein assumed, then eight of the eleven passages are concerned with the

---

1. Cf. Kelly, J. N. D., Early Christian Creeds, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950), pp. 11-13, 16ff.

2. Listed on p. 20.

Messiahship of Jesus. Twice the fulfillment Scriptures is appealed to for proof of the Messiahship. The crucifixion forms the theme only once, and then in connection with several other items in the most expanded of these editorial summaries (17:2-3). The resurrection of Jesus is mentioned in two passages, once in the passage just mentioned in connection with the crucifixion. The "Name" of Jesus is alluded to once. Paul's preaching to pagans (19:26) seems to have been concerned with the unreality of their gods. Luke undoubtedly intended this to be taken as the same sort of argument he describes more fully twice before (14:15-17 and 17:22-31) and which is described in the charts as "Appeal to Natural Reason". The "Universality of the <u>kerygma</u> is implied twice. "The Kingdom of God" is the subject in three instances. In one instance baptism is mentioned. In two cases there is a "Call to Faith". There is no mention of repentance in this material.

It is clear from this survey of Luke's editorial summaries that, according to his opinion, the dominant theme of the <u>kerygma</u> is the Messiahship of Jesus. The aim of the <u>kerygma</u> is not indicated in these summaries, therefore, it is not surprising that there is no mention of repentance therein. Believing or faith which is one of the items in the appeal, is mentioned twice, to be sure. But in both cases it is quite incidental and only indicates the success of the missions described.

The absence, then, of a mention of repentance in this material does not weaken the conclusion stated above, that the aim of the kerygma is to produce repentance and a new ethical relationship to God.[1]

Two important conclusions seem to be warranted at this point. 1. The aim of the kerygma, evident in the motif of the Synoptic material, is reflected also in Acts, namely, a call to repentance and new ethical relationship to God. 2. While the subject of the Synoptic motif is the coming of the kingdom of God, Luke describes the dominant subject of the kerygma as the Messiahship of Jesus. Of course, the kingdom of God is by no means absent in Acts. On the other hand, in the nature of the case the subject of the kerygma must make some such change from the Synoptics to the material concerned with the life of the early Church. Nevertheless this change will be significant for the discussion in the next chapter.

The question must now be raised as to how the Pauline evidence corresponds to the Synoptics and Acts with regard to these conclusions.

It will be noted at the outset that repentance is referred to only once in the Pauline evidence (II Cor. 5:20)

---

1. It is worthy of note that more than half of the speeches in Acts cited in this study contain a reference to repentance, while the position in the narrative of some of the others is adequate to explain the absence in them of this item.

and then the actual word, μετάνοια, is not used. The idea, however, seems to be clearly present in the phrase, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ. The fact is that μετάνοια and its derivatives appear rarely in Paul's writings. If it were not for this latter fact, the reason for the near absence of repentance in the Pauline material, in contrast to the Synoptics and Acts, might well be sought in the incidental and occasional nature of Paul's references to the <u>kerygma</u>. Yet even this latter consideration would not completely account for the difference because in several instances the occasion makes a reference to repentance quite relevant, therefore, noticeable by its absence.

At the same time, the emphasis on faith shows an increase in Paul. Belief or faith occur thirteen times in the thirty-four passages in Acts but in the twenty-five passages from Paul they occur twelve times. Apparently the "Call to Faith" takes the place in Paul of the "Call to Repentance".

This observation, however, requires some modification. In Acts repentance and belief or faith stand side by side; so that Paul's almost exclusive emphasis on faith in his references to preaching is not, strictly speaking, a substitution. What actually appears to be the case is that in the Synoptics the emphasis falls on repentance,[1] in Acts

---

1. An appeal for belief is not absent here. Cf. Mk. 1:15.

faith is an added emphasis in the appeal, and in Paul the emphasis is placed on faith almost exclusively.

The purpose of this chapter is to attempt a description of the kerygma as it appears at the level of the New Testament documents. Therefore, discussions of original form and development must be reserved until later. The question here is, does this difference of Paul from the Synoptics and Acts represent an actual difference of aim in his preaching?

There is good reason for believing that for Paul faith involved strong ethical implications. Paul's concern with ethical living, so manifest in his letters, needs no comment.[1] What is important to observe is that this ethical living is for him directly related to faith. Twice, in connection with the kerygma, Paul speaks of "obedience to the faith" (Rom. 1:5; 16:26). In the light of such phrases as: "So that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" (II Cor. 4:11); "So that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (II Cor. 5:21); "the love which you have for all the saints, because of the hope laid up for you in heaven" (Col. 1:5); "in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him, provided that you continue in the faith, stable and steadfast, not shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard" (Col. 1:22-23);

---

1. Note that ethical exhortation appears to have been an integral part of Paul's kerygma in I Thess. 2:11-12.

"As therefore you received Christ Jesus the Lord, so live in him, rooted and built up in him and established in the faith, just as you were taught" (Col. 2:6-7) this "obedience" seems clearly to have an ethical meaning. Faith for Paul was, then, as much a matter of moral faithfulness as the intellectual acceptance of an idea. The thought seems to be that the former follows necessarily from the latter.[1]

At any rate, the ethical aim is present in Paul's kerygma quite as much as in the Synoptics and Acts, though in a somewhat different form.

As for the second conclusion concerning the Messiahship of Jesus, it is immediately apparent that, in spite of the more incidental and occasional nature of the Pauline evidence, the emphasis on this theme appears even greater here than in Acts. Nineteen of the twenty-five passages in Paul refer to it as compared to fourteen out of thirty-four in Acts. The emphasis, at any rate, is not significantly different from that found in the editorial summaries in Acts.[2]

Turning to the later epistles it will be observed that the theme of Jesus' Messiahship is fully maintained. Four out of the five passages adduced refer to it. The fact that by this time the title "Christ" may have lost some of its

---

1. See the discussion of Pauline theology in Weizsäcker, TAA, Vol. I., esp. p. 169.

2. Cf. the "Messianic Character" in Table II, p. 79.

original connotation and become more like a proper name does not militate against this conclusion but rather provides an illustration of the great prevalence of the idea.

The question of the aim of the kerygma in this later material is more difficult. The paucity of the evidence allows little to be inferred from it. The connections in which preaching is mentioned are such as to make its description at this point indefinite. As the evidence stands, there is no mention of repentance and in the five passages there is one mention of believing and one of faith. On the other hand there are indications of ethical interest and presuppositions particularly in the phrases, "a holy calling", and, "the truth which accords with godliness".[1]

The conclusions reached above with regard to the Synoptic and Acts material are applicable to the rest of the evidence as well.

It is apparent, if the above conclusions are accepted, that the logical argument of the kerygma somehow proceeds from certain statements about Jesus to an appeal for repentance, faith and a new ethical relationship to God. The nature of the kerygma, therefore, is to be discovered by observing the various steps in this argument.

Any description of the argument in the kerygma must begin with the fact that, as far as the New Testament evi-

---

1. Cf. the succeeding verses of Titus 1.

dence goes, it always concerned Jesus. The preponderance of evidence indicates that the point of this concern lay in the belief that he was in some way the fulfillment of Jewish messianic expectations.

Second to this in frequency in the evidence is the recounting of certain facts of his life[1] by far the most prominent among which are the crucifixion and the resurrection. The other three items in this category were manifestly used in support of these two.[2]

In view of the emphasis on Jesus' Messianic character, it is not surprising to find frequent reference to the background of messianic expectancy. This reference has taken several forms. But in every case these references function as arguments for the Messiahship of Jesus.

Similarly the eschatological items play a supporting role. They are all based on the belief that Jesus had signalled the eschatological event and, for the most part at least, follow logically from the messianic claims attributed to Jesus. Likewise, the effects of believing the kerygma can be understood as following from the believer's place in the messianic community.

The universal applicability of the kerygma and an-

---

1. See "His Life History" in Chart III., p. 72.

2. Even the familiar statement in Acts 10:38, "He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil," is made for the purpose of making the crucifixion all the more unjust.

nouncement that the proclamation of this gospel was commanded fit quite naturally into the pattern of messianic ideas.

Thus it may be seen that the argument of the kerygma characteristically includes these two steps: 1. The attribution of a messianic role to Jesus. 2. His crucifixion and resurrection. The assumptions appear to be that the coming of Jesus somehow proved the urgency of the crisis that confronted the hearers and that His coming had in some way made possible a new relationship to God. Repentance and faith were, therefore, both critically necessary and possible.

The final task of this study is to consider the various forms which this line of argument has taken to see if logical inferences can be drawn from them sufficient for a reconstruction of the primitive history of the kerygma. This will be undertaken in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORY OF THE KERYGMA

L. Harold DeWolf once outlined his conception of the development of the kerygma, and its relation to the New Testament, with a diagram which began with a horizontal line representing the events, memories and first interpretations of Jesus' life.[1] A number of short lines extending downward from this line represented lost traditions about Jesus, disciples, etc. Other lines continued down to a parallel horizontal line representing the New Testament. These lines represented, of course, those items which remained more or less constant from the first. Between the two horizontal lines was a circle representing the kerygma. Some of the continuing lines passed through the circle as part of the kerygma. Others were bent toward the circle as attracted by it but not conformed to it (or part of it). Another line from the top by-passed both the circle and the bottom horizontal line as tradition, etc., which remain outside the canonical sources. Several lines originated within the circle and continued to the bottom as traditions arising from elaboration of the kerygma. Still other short lines repre-

---

1. Drawn on the back of a page of the writer's, "The Kerygma and Christian Symbols", a paper written for Harold DeWolf's course, "The History of Christian Doctrine, I, Boston University, Jan. 9, 1953.

sented traditions arising later, not out of the kerygma, but from other sources which found their way into the New Testament.

Naturally, this diagram suffers from certain limitations. For instance, the representation of the kerygma by a circle suspended between the original "events" and the New Testament is not quite accurate because the kerygma was a active factor from the first and continued alongside of the writing of the New Testament itself. With such limitations understood, this description of the development of the kerygma seems to have a great deal to commend it. The preceeding chapters of this study have shown the kind of variety and flexibility in the New Testament evidence that would be expected to result from this kind of growth.

It is the task of this chapter to attempt a reconstruction of this growth. Manifestly, such a reconstruction can be no more than a likely hypothesis. But if this study succeeds in establishing with a reasonable degree of probability the general pattern which the development assumed, it will be well worth the attempt. No description of the kerygma can hope to be complete. The high degree of probability that there were other items forever lost through fortuitous omission from the records must be borne in mind.

It may be argued, on the other hand, that the omission of such items would in itself indicate that at least they were not dominant themes and were not preserved partly

because the Christian community found them no longer useful. Modern research, therefore, is not completely at the mercy of accident in studying the sources on such a subject as this.

The items that have been preserved in the extant documents show thereby a certain degree of likelihood of having been found useful for the continuing needs of the Church and therefore dominant, and pragmatically and logically more satisfactory. Of course, even here the weight of influence of a dominant personality such as that of Paul may have operated to cause the preservation of some items which would otherwise have been lost.

Such considerations advise caution in seeking too positive and detailed conclusions about either the content or the history of the kerygma.

1. Ethical Interest in the Kerygma.

It was suggested in the preceeding chapter that the proper starting point for a description of the nature of the kerygma should logically be its aim or purpose.[1] That aim was shown to be to produce repentance and a new ethical relationship with God in the hearers.

If this is true, the aim of the kerygma is also the proper starting-point for a description of its history. If

1. Above, p. 98.

the account of the preaching of Jesus recorded in the Synoptics can be accepted as authentic--as it is herein assumed--here is one line that persists from the beginning through to the time of the writing of the New Testament records. This, therefore, will be regarded as a constant factor of primary importance. In the nature of the case, other items will stand in a logical relationship to it.

It must first of all be asked: In how far does this aim show evidence of change, expansion or elaboration? What is under discussion here is the contents of the category, "The Appeal" (See Chart III, p. 72), and the corresponding items in the Synoptic evidence. This category contains three items: repentance, baptism, and faith. It will be instructive to observe the relative prominence of one or another of these items in the various blocks of evidence and to observe the connection into which these items are brought in their contexts.

The change of emphasis from repentance to faith in the evidence has already been noted in connection with a discussion of the nature of the kerygma. It must now be examined to see if this change actually indicates a development. The fact is that repentance (μετανοέω), predominate in the Synoptic evidence, virtually disappears in Paul, but returns with an emphasis somewhat less than faith (9 vs.

14 occurrences) in Acts.[1] It is completely absent in the evidence from later Epistles. On the other hand, faith (πιστεύω) occurs only once in the Synoptic evidence herein adduced (Mark 1:14-15). In Paul, faith occurs twelve times, and in the later Epistles it occurs twice.

The oldest documents, therefore, express the appeal in terms of faith but the oldest tradition stresses repentance.[2] The fact that Acts brings back the appeal for repentance may indicate a faithfulness to earlier tradition, but this is by no means certain. Variety in the kerygma does not necessarily mean linear development. It may simply indicate the different characteristics of the various preachers or sources. Furthermore, since in the indirect evidence no item would be more apt to be taken for granted, it would be precarious to infer much from this phenomenon.

There is, nevertheless, a possible explanation for the change from repentance to faith in the evidence. Jesus' preaching was addressed to the Jews--as was that of John the Baptist--and therefore, in the vein of the prophetic tradition, it consisted of a call to repentance and return to righteous living. But the farther removed the evangelists became both geographically and in time from Jesus, the more

---

1. The word itself does not occur in Paul at all but the idea seems to be present in II Cor. 5:20. See p. 102.

2. This, as has already been shown, doesn't mean a weakening of the ethical motive.

it became necessary to appeal for belief as well. Jesus' own appeal seems to have assumed the tenets of Judaism--including an eschatological hope--to be shared by His hearers. As the distance from His own preaching became greater the logic of the kerygma became more involved and the appeal, of necessity, included the acceptance of certain of the steps in the argument.[1] Hence Paul's emphasis on belief in his work among the diaspora and gentiles. This development will more directly concern the study later in this chapter.

The important point here is that the fundamental motives have not changed. The ethical-religious aim remains throughout. The variation between faith and repentance is most probably due to individual difference, varying circumstances, and, to some extent, statistical accident.[2]

The question of the function and meaning of baptism is difficult and probably no very satisfactory answer can be had. The important thing at this point is to search for any signs of development in the idea in the kerygma and any implications it may hold concerning the aim of the latter.

It has already been suggested that the antecedent of

---

1. See Ropes, TAA, p. 37ff. Cf. Weizsäcker, TAA, Vol. I, pp. 32-33.

2. Note argument above, pp. 103-04.

Christian baptism was most probably John's baptism.[1] This is evident by the treatment of the latter both in the Synoptics and in Acts.[2] Jesus is quoted as referring to it with approval (Mk. 11:30 and parallels). Both Peter and Paul are made to allude to it in Acts (10:37 and 19:4). This is consonant with the whole treatment of John in the New Testament as the herald of the Christian movement.[3] It may be well, therefore, to look for a moment at John's baptism.

Josephus describes this baptism in the familiar passage:

> . . . for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing (with water) would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away (or the remission) of some sins (only), but for the purification of the body: supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness.[4]

---

1. Above, p. 86, Note 1.

2. Cf. Cadbury, MLA, pp. 42-48.

3. Of course, according to the Synoptics, Jesus was baptized by John. It does not necessarily follow that he therefore adopted the practice in His own ministry. Enslin thinks it highly improbable that Jesus was either baptized by John or that baptism was "a phase of the Master's ministry at all". CB, pp. 156, 194.

4. Antiquities, XVIII, 5, (tr. William Whiston, Philadelphia: David McKay, n. d.). Cited in Cadbury, MLA, pp. 42-43.

Josephus here is obviously at variance with the Gospel tradition with regard to the meaning of John's baptism, even though "the purification of the body" probably refers to ceremonial cleanliness rather than sanitation in a modern sense.[1]

There is good reason, however, to accept the Gospel tradition at this point rather than Josephus. In the first place, Josephus is controlled by a bias quite as much as the Evangelists. "John's baptism is explained rationally to suit Western readers, in the way in which Josephus throughout handles the ritual of the Jews."[2]

On the other hand, the Evangelists give no reason for supposing that John's baptism was significantly different from the general practice in Judiasm. Surely, if there had been any grounds for such a theory, it would have appeared somewhere in the New Testament! But what was that practice?

Baptism had become, for one thing, a condition for receiving proselytes into the Commonwealth of Israel. Kirsopp Lake cites an argument between Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and Rabbi Joshua ben Hananiah in which the latter "went so far as to claim that a man was a proselyte if he were baptized even though he were not circumcised.[3] Lake goes on in the same

---

1. Even in this idea of ceremonial cleanliness there is a quasi-ethical motivation growing out of the Old Testament notion of holiness.

2. Cadbury, MLA, p. 43.

3. Lake, Art. (1933), p. 78.

article to raise the question as to whether "there is not a certain sense that belief, circumcision, and baptism form a connected whole".[1] The conclusion that he reaches with reference to the relation between baptism in Judaism and Christianity is worth quoting:

> It is obvious that to the Christian scholar the most important part of these conditions for the acceptance of a proselyte are the two which were taken over by the Christian church--instruction and baptism. Originally, as in Judaism, instruction preceded baptism, though the position was reversed when child baptism was introduced, just as it was reversed in Judaism where, with children born into the covenant, circumcision preceded instruction.[2]

It is apparent that the Jewish background to John's baptism as here described raises as many problems as it answers. If baptism was an initiatory rite into Judaism, did John use it as such? Neither Josephus nor the Evangelists seem to say so. In the passage from Josephus, quoted above, it is Jews who are invited "to come to baptism". In the Synoptics the same is true. This appears to be the case in Mark's words, "And there went out to him all the country of Judea, and all the people of Jerusalem. . ." (1:5). But it becomes explicit in the phrase in Matthew 3:7 (and parallel), "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming for bap-

---

1. Lake, Art. (1933), p. 79.

2. Lake, Art. (1933), p. 79.

tism". It is clear, then, that, in this case at least, baptism is used in another connection than proselyting.[1] That this is not a unique case seems clear from the way in which Josephus speaks of it.[2] There was therefore ample precedent available to the Christian movement at its earliest stages for the use of baptism in another connection than proselyting, i. e., a rite associated with reform movements within Judiasm.

Did John's baptism furnish any further precedent for the Christian preacher? If the tradition concerning John is at all trustworthy, his preaching consisted of an appeal for repentance and an ethical renewal into direct connection with which his baptism was brought. Jesus' approval of the latter, referred to above, may only reflect early Church thinking on the matter. But, nevertheless, it is evidence that, in some quarters at least, baptism was regarded by the Christians as associated with repentance and ethical renewal.

The contrast drawn between John's baptism with water and Jesus' baptism "with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Mt. 3:11 and parallels) may only be a way of embracing John and

1. Cf. Enslin, CB, pp. 152-53.

2. It is possible, of course, that John's baptism served as an initiatory rite into a Jewish sect, which Josephus chose to overlook for reasons of his own.

at the same time keeping him in his proper place as the forerunner of Jesus.[1]

Apparently, from the Synoptics, Jesus did not baptize--though the Fourth Gospel has His disciples do it, evidently with His sanction (Jn. 3:22, 26; 4:2). It is impossible, therefore, to tell when baptism entered the Christian practice. It had been there long enough for Paul to take it for granted. Quite possibly the Fourth Gospel is right that the practice goes clear back to John in fairly direct continuity.

At any rate, it appeared very early and was in some way associated with John's baptism, and therefore with repentance and ethical renewal.

The question must now be faced as to what place baptism occupies in the <u>kerygma</u> evidence outside the Gospels.

The Acts evidence contains six references to baptism: 2:38; 8:12; 8:37; 10:47 (and 37); 19:4; 22:16. In 2:38 it is explicitly "for the forgiveness of your sins". In 8:12 and 19 the significance of the rite is not indicated. This is true also of 10:47, although John's baptism is mentioned and the inference may be allowed that the two are related. If this is true, then this baptism is for repentance.[2] 19:4 presents a contrast between John's baptism of repentance and baptism in the Name of Jesus, the chief point of difference

---

1. Cf. Cadbury, MLA, p. 47.

2. The difficulty here is that Cornelius' household had already received the Holy Spirit and this could hardly have preceded repentance.

in which seems to be the subsequent gift of the Holy Spirit. However, this does not necessarily rule out the element of repentance. It is much more a matter of the "Power of the Name" to produce the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. This passage adds little by way of positive knowledge about the meaning of baptism except that, associated with the "Power of the Name", it becomes religiously efficacious. In 22:6 baptism becomes more clearly sacramental. Here it is not strictly a matter of repentance, for Paul is invited to "wash away your sins".

Luke's evidence for the meaning of baptism is ambiguous. The most that can be said is that out of six references to it in his kerygma material, two connect it with the forgiveness of sins and two refer to it in connection with John's baptism.[1] Repentance as its purpose is not ruled out by this fact but neither is it established as the essential meaning of baptism. The association of baptism with the "Name" of Jesus does look toward a sacramental meaning.

Turning to the Pauline evidence, it will be noted that baptism is referred to in connection with the kerygma only once, in colossians 2:12. Even here it may be questioned whether the Colossians "were taught" the construction which

---

1. If the alternate reading, 8:37, be accepted, baptism is once associated with belief. (See RSV, note g.) But here belief is a prerequisite and not the purpose of baptism.

Paul is here putting on Baptism. He is arguing from their conversion experience, so there is no doubt that baptism was preached to them (though, of course, not by Paul[1]). But it does not at all follow that they were given the meaning of baptism which Paul here seeks to draw out of it.

It is evident that little is to be learned of the meaning or development of baptism in the kerygma from this evidence. It appears to have been taken for granted to a large extent. But the little that may be learned seems to indicate a sacramental meaning. How far back may this be traced? Silva New believes that it does not go back of Paul:

> Such a baptism (Paul's in Rom. 6:3ff) is definitely sacramental. That of John was a baptism unto repentance, and did not assume that it at all changed the nature of the penitent or had any direct connexion with salvation. Jesus himself probably did not baptize, but after his death his disciples may have done so and used his Name in order to distinguish their converts or penitents from those of John and his disciples. Of this stage, however, there is no evidence, and it is a long step from it to sacramental baptism. It is a step which might well have been made by a man who connected the outward ceremony of baptism and the consequent sloughing off of his own sinfulness with the inward experience of unity with Jesus; but if so, it is another instance of how often

---

1. It may be noted in passing that Paul is here presupposing anothers' kerygma. From this and I Cor. 15:11 it appears that there did exist a community of ideas among the early Christians which Paul could take for granted.

> in the history of religion similarity of phrase bridges a deep diversity of thought.[1]

Of course the question turns on the definition of a sacrament. But if a sacrament in any way involves the power by an outward act to produce a spiritual effect, then at least two passages in the Acts evidence seem to have a sacramental flavor (2:38 and 22:16), so that the sacramental idea is not confined to Paul, and, indeed, may not have originated with him.[2]

It has been noted that in Acts the efficacy of baptism is connected with the "Power of the Name", a connection which is not characteristic of Paul's treatment of the subject. The sacramental element in baptism results in this case from the use of the "Name". The "Name" in Acts is not a matter of identification but a means of appropriating Jesus' power. This Silva New has argued effectively.[3] Therefore, unless Luke's dependence upon Paul at this point is assumed, the sacramental element in baptism is not restricted to Paul. It may well be asked if baptism did not have more than a mere symbolic significance even for John.[4]

---

1. New, Art. (1933), pp. 131-32.

2. Would one be apt to develop into a sacrament a rite of which he made so little use as Paul apparently did of baptism (I Cor. 1:14ff.)?

3. New, Art. (1933), pp. 132ff. See also above, p. 17.

4. Schweitzer, PHI, p. 242f.

The point here is that baptism appears to have been commonly proclaimed in the kerygma. It seems to have borne a definite relationship to repentance and forgiveness of sins but its meaning is not altogether clear--and probably not uniform.

Some more or less linear development may be inferred from the evidence to have taken place between John's baptism and the time of Paul and the writing of Acts. There is, in the first place, a possible heightening of sacramental significance. In Paul, this is associated with his Christ-mysticism. In Acts, it results from the use of the "Name" in connection with baptism and, possibly, the accompanying gift of the Holy Spirit. It is quite likely that this latter connection was significant for Paul as well but Paul went beyond it.[1]

The sacramental element in connection with the use of the "Name" may well have been a development that took place almost immediately in the post-resurrection community. The use of baptism as an initiatory rite analogous to circumcision in Judiasm can easily be accounted for as resulting from the requirements of the gentile mission and gradual separation of Christianity from the synagogue. In any case, there seems to be in baptism a way of appropriating Jesus' power for moral achievement and relationship with God.

---

1. New, Art. (1933), p. 131ff.

Baptism in that case forms a connecting link between the categories, "The Appeal" and "His Effect on Believers".

The important thing to note at this point is that baptism continues throughout to reflect the ethical aim of the kerygma, even while manifesting a sacramental element.

2. The Place of Jesus in the Kerygma

One of the most certain conclusions as to the nature of the New Testament kerygma is that it always concerned Jesus.[1] If the conclusions in the preceeding chapter are correct, this means that in one way or another the argument began with Jesus. Insofar as the New Testament provides any information on the question, all the lines of development in the kerygma lead back to Jesus. The question to be pursued in this section, therefore, is: What foundation did the fact of Jesus provide for "The Appeal"?

In Jesus' own preaching, according to the Synoptics, the appeal was based on the imminence of the kingdom of God.[2] But what authority was there for this? A. H. Silver explains Jesus' message as due to a common belief.

> When Jesus came into Galilee, "spreading the gospel of the Kingdom of God and saying the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand," he was voicing the opinion universally held that the year 5000

1. Above, p. 105f.

2. Cf. Silver, MSI, pp. 7-8, 11.

> in the Creation calendar, which is to usher in the sixth millenium--the age of the Kingdom of God--was at hand. It was this chronologic fact which inflamed the Messianic hope of the people.
> . . . .
>
> The whole epic of Jesus must be read in the light of this millenarian Chronology of his day, or it remains unintelligible.[1]

The universality of this dating of "the age of the kingdom of God" may be seriously doubted. (Cf. the twelve periods in IV Esdras Vii. 14:1-17 and Baruch VI. 55 with the ten weeks in Enoch 91-93, etc.) The long period over which the apocalyptic literature appeared (nearly three centuries), the tendency of the apocalyptists to make the final period coincide with their own age, and the general practice of making the world-period schemes correspond to the times of outstanding personages or dynasties, particularly threatening or oppressing world powers,[2] all indicate that eschatological hopes were neither uniform nor based on such an abstract scheme as Silver suggests.[3]

That there was a high degree of eschatological expectation in the time of Jesus is to be taken for granted. But such cannot have been the full explanation of the authority for Jesus' message. All such eschatological announcements

---

1. Silver, MSI, pp. 6, 8.

2. Cf. Dan. 9, etc.

3. Cf. Drummond, JM, p. 318.

involved an element of personal authority, whether a secret source of knowledge, i.e., visions, dreams, etc., a certain skill in interpreting the sacred writings, or simply an ipse dixit pronouncement. How Jesus knew that the "time is fulfilled" is not stated. His hearers were apparently asked to take it on His word that "the signs of the times" pointed unmistakably in that direction (Mt. 16:1-4).

At the start, then, the appeal was made on the personal authority of Jesus. People should repent because Jesus commanded it in view of the nearness of the kingdom. But on what basis did the early Church, preaching to people who probably had never heard Jesus, appeal for repentance and belief? They still argued from Jesus, but on what basis?

It was shown in the preceeding chapter that in slightly over two-thirds of the references to the kerygma (outside the Synoptics) one or another messianic title was applied to Jesus.[1] Table II shows this emphasis to be consistent throughout the classifications of the evidence. It hardly needs to be said that the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, in some sense, is manifest throughout the New Testament. The point here is that the most prominent and consistent step in the argument of the kerygma is His Messiahship, at least by the time of Paul.

Whether Jesus Himself claimed to be the Messiah or

---

1. Above, p. 81.

whether it was claimed for Him during His life are questions into which this study need not enter. But that the post-resurrection kerygma began with just that claim seems most probable. Probably Luke's information as to the earliest apostolic preaching is nowhere more reliable than here. As careful as Paul is to maintain the independence of his gospel (Gal. 1:11-12), he freely admits to having received this among other items about Jesus from others before him. (I Cor. 15:3. Possibly Rom. 1:3-4 is also a part of the tradition for which he was indebted to the early Church). An item appearing with such prominence so early in the tradition certainly deserves to be adjudged coeval with the latter.

It is not difficult to see the function of this item in the argument of the kerygma. For at least certain strands of Jewish thought the messianic and apocalyptic "had been identical."[1] Lacking the personal presence of Jesus, they could appeal to His Messianic role as proof of the "fullness of time" and imminence of the eschaton. The messianic claim for Him would also help in interpreting the meaning of His death but this will be reserved to the next section.

It may be assumed, then, that the kerygma from the

---

1. Cadbury, MLA, p. 276. It should be noted, however, that a number of apocalyptic writings know nothing of a messiah. The place of the messiah in apocalyptic literature is conveniently described in Pfeiffer, NTT, p. 50.

first included in its argument the proclamation of the Messiahship of Jesus. But what development can be discovered and what was the character of this item in the argument?

The whole perplexing question of the background and meaning of the term, messiah, especially in extra-canonical literature, would lead this study too far afield and yield too little by way of relevant conclusions to be entered into here in any detail.[1] For one thing, it must remain an open question in how far the apostolic preachers drew upon apocalyptic sources for their interpretation of Jesus and how far their preaching resulted from their own creativity in meeting the apologetic and evangelistic needs that confronted them.

While a general atmosphere of messianic expectancy may be taken for granted, it does not follow that the messianic theory of any one or another of the extant apocalyptic writings represents what was prevalent in the thinking of either the preachers or the hearers of the kerygma. What renders the problem of contemporary concepts of the messiah even more insoluble is the fact that there is no assurance that the extant literature is to any reliable degree representative of the period. R. H. Charles says that

---

1. Enslin says: "In both the canonical books of the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha the noteworthy thing is that there is no mention at all of what we are wont to speak of as "the messiah." The earliest reference to the Messiah as a standing title is in the Synoptic gospels." CB, p. 139.

> . . . all the great Jewish apocalypses which were written before A.D. 10, and which carried on the mystical and spiritual side of religion as opposed to the legalistic, Judaism dropped and banned after its breach with Christianity, just as it dropped and banned the Greek translation of the Old Testament.[1]

It appears, then, that the responsibility for the preservation of what now remains of that literature must be laid at the door of Christianity.[2] It may afirly be assumed that at least a measure of control was exercised by the developing Church governing the selection of literature being preserved. At least the fate of the apocalyptic literature cannot be supposed to be entirely independent of the growing dogmatic interests of Christianity. Add to this the question as to what extent this literature was known and influential among the common people of either Judea or the diaspora, and the problem of a precise definition of popular messianic ideas for the first century A.D. becomes practically hopeless, at least until further light can be had.

On the other hand, probably Dodd has gone too far in eliminating extra-canonical literature from consideration when he says of Enoch:

> . . . the Similitudes are in any case an isolated and probably eccentric authority for the association of the title "Son of

---

1. DNT, p. 44.

2. Pfeiffer, NTT, pp. 72, 86.

> Man" with an "apocalyptic Messiah," and cannot be used with any confidence to elucidate the New Testament.[1]

The similarity of messianic titles in the Similitudes of Enoch and the first part of Acts is too great to be ignored. Pfeiffer reflects no such grave doubt as to either the pre-Christian date or correspondence of messianic titles in this work with the New Testament.[2]

As impossible as it is to derive an explanation of the messianic concepts in the kerygma from the apocalypses, it will, nevertheless, be instructive to observe some of the characteristics of the latter in this regard.

The etymological history of the word "messiah" hardly needs rehearsing here and certainly it has little to offer toward an understanding of the significance of the application of the word to Jesus.[3] One thing to be kept in mind is the fact that in the course of the development of the idea the generic meaning of the word, "messiah", is often left far behind and, not infrequently, related notions which commonly go under the term, "messianic", are expressed by quite different words.

---

1. ATS, pp. 116-17.

2. NTT, pp. 76, 78. Cf. Greenstone, MIJ, pp. 64-65 and Enoch, pp. 50-51.

3. Although Oesterley presents a very interesting study of the mythological background of the idea of the messiah. See Oesterley, EMI, pp. 195-96. This whole book throws a helpful light on the background of messianic thought.

The idea, in any case, has a history of considerable importance in pre-Christian Judaism, and one that furnished the apostolic preachers with a wealth of material upon which to draw in interpreting Jesus. Probably the oldest phase of Messianism began when the term

> . . . came to be applied in a special sense in connection with the expectation of the Scion of David whom God would raise up for the rule and deliverance of Israel. This hope was based on the belief in the permanency of David's dynasty which is expressed in 2 Sam. vii. 16, and which persisted in spite of the evil fortunes of his house and even after the monarchy ceased to exist. Its real foundation, however, was religious; it rested in the unwavering conviction regarding the faithfulness of God to His purpose of founding a Kingdom of righteousness of which Israel would be the expression and symbol.[1]

It is customary to treat messianic thought under two categories: Davidic, which is in the main political and mundane, and the Daniel-Enoch "Son of Man" type, which is supermundane and apocalyptic.

That both types are present in the kerygma is evident from the references to Jesus' Davidic ancestry, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, from the use of such terms as "the Anointed One", "the Righteous One" and "the Elect One". These are "titles applied for the first time in literature

---

1. Taylor, JHS, pp. 12-13.

to the personal Messiah in the Similitudes [and] are afterwards reproduced in the New Testament."[1]

It is interesting to note that the term, "the Son of Man", prominent in the Similitudes and in the Synoptics, occurs only once in the kerygma evidence.[2] This would seem to indicate that there is no very direct dependence of apostolic thought upon the Similitudes themselves.

A third type of messianic thought connects itself with the "Suffering Servant" of Deutero-Isaiah. Dodd believes that the basis of New Testament Christology lies "in the understanding of the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus in the light of a combination of the ideas of Son of Man and Servant."[3] Of the relation between Deutero-Isaiah and the apocalypses, Schweitzer has this to say:

> Jesus therefore applied to the Messiah the descriptions of the sufferings of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii. It is interesting to note that in the Apocalypses of Enoch, Baruch, and Ezra we already find expressions used about the Messiah and the Son of Man which go back to the Deutero-Isaiah passages about the servant of the Lord. Thus in Enoch the Son of Man is called, in imitation of Isaiah liii. 11, "the Righteous" (Enoch xxxviii. 2, xlvi. 2,

---

1. Charles, BOE, p. 51.

2. In fact the term is found only three times in the New Testament outside the Gospels (Acts 7:56; Rev. 1:13; 14:14). But see comment on its absence in Paul, Schweitzer, MPA, p. 90.

3. ATS, p. 119. Cf. Taylor, JHS, p. 20.

> xlvii. 1, xlvii. 4), and in accordance with Isaiah xlii. 1 "the Chosen" (Enoch xxxix. 6, xlv. 3, xlviii. 6, xlix. 2). In the Apocalypse of Baruch (ixx. 9) and of Ezra (4 Ezra vii. 28) the Messiah is designated by God as His servant; in the Apocalypse of Ezra (4 Ezra xiii. 32) "the Son of Man" also.[1] The connection of the Messiah--Son of Man--with the suffering Servant of the Lord, which was completed by Jesus, was thus already more or less current in the language of Later Jewish Eschatology.[2]

It appears doubtful that all the messianic ideas which were in circulation at the beginning of the first century can be included in these three types. The third Sibylline Oracle, for instance, presents a picture of a holy, immortal king which hardly fits any of these categories. Taylor, of course, is stating a minimum truth in saying that "it is not possible to reduce all the ideas which gather round the figure of the Messiah to a single conception."[3] In fact, Enslin's reserve seems well advised in saying that it is "most unwise to try to give a fictitious appearance of simplicity to a singularly complicated and obscure matter".[4]

Since, in any case, no attempt is to be made here to account for the messianic thought in the kerygma by means

---

1. Here, in the English translation from which this quotation was taken, F. C. Burkett calls attention in a footnote to the fact that "the text in 4 Ezra has 'my Son', not 'Son of Man'".

2. MPA, p. 59.

3. JHS, p. 16.

4. CB, p. 143.

of either Old Testament or apocalyptic materials, it will be necessary to do no more than recall a few of the important lines of thought in this material.

This is by no means to say that the already existing messianic ideas had no influence but it does mean that lacking any decisive evidence of direct determining influence, and in the face of the wide variation in these ideas, it appears wise to allow the apostolic preachers a considerable degree of original creativity in making use of the ideas at hand. It is worthy of note that both Luke and Paul appear to take for granted a knowledge of messianism on the part of their hearers (perhaps better, readers).[1]

Some of the more important messianic ideas available to the early preachers may be briefly described as follows: The messiah (whatever may be the title) is the divinely appointed agent of God's righteous purpose. Sometimes he is a mere human personality anointed with God's Spirit; at other times he appears to be an angelic being.[2] At times it appears that the messianic age is a terrestrial, political affair; other writers make it a supermundane eternal order.[3]

In the later apocalypses, the messianic age precedes

---

1. There are exceptions to this as will be seen a little later.

2. Greenstone, MIJ, p. 41, 72-73.

3. Charles, DNT, p. 19.

and is separate from the eternal eschaton.[1] The messiah is sometimes immortal; at other times he has a definite span of life allotted him.[2] Sometimes he represents God in Judgment but in other cases he only leads up to the Day of Judgment.[3] Likewise the messiah is portrayed as the ruler in the eschaton by some thinkers while in others he will finally relinquish all authority to God alone.[4] His kingdom in some instances is to include all nations and in others only Israel, which he is to deliver and separate from all enemies.[5]

According to some writers, he is preexistent, to others he will arise from the messianic community.[6] For some he will come as humble and lowly but according to others his coming will be attended with great majesty. In some cases, it appears that the messiah is to come at a divinely appointed time; in others, his coming is contingent upon repentance and a new righteousness on the part of Israel.[7]

---

1. IV Esdras 7:28-30. Cf. Pfeiffer, NTT, p. 50.

2. Cf. IV Esdras 7:26-30 with Sibylline Oracle III.

3. Cf. IV Esdras 7:28-33 with Enoch 49:4. For opposite view see Drummond JM, p. 390. Cf. Charles, DNT, pp. 58-59.

4. Cf. Sibylline Oracle III with IV Esdras, et al. See also Greenstone, MIJ, pp. 41-42.

5. Charles, DNT, p. 66. Cf. Sibylline Oracle III with Psalms of Solomon, 17.

6. Enoch 48:6; 90:37.

7. Cohen, ET, p. 373.

To such a welter of ideas as this the early Christian preacher must have spoken. And from such a variety he could choose the material out of which he was to shape his interpretation of Jesus' messiahship and the argument of his *kerygma*.[1]

One important observation must be made with regard to the comparison of this literature with the New Testament. In the former the messiah stands second to the *eschaton*, often receding to a place of little or no importance, and not infrequently disappearing altogether; while in the latter Jesus as the Messiah dominates the scene throughout. As R. H. Charles has put it:

> . . . Whereas the Messianic kingdom in the Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic is just as frequently conceived without the Messiah as with Him, in the New Testament the Messiah forms its divine Head and Centre, and membership of the kingdom is constituted first and chiefly by a living relationship to Him.[2]

Obviously, then, messianic thought has taken a unique turn in the New Testament.

It is time now to turn to the *kerygma* evidence to see

---

1. Vincent Taylor writes: "It is abundantly manifest that in the days of Jesus the way stood open for a Messianic claimant to select from among existing conceptions and according to the degree of his insight, to make of them a symbol of redemptive activity at once old and new". JHS, pp. 17-18.

2. DNT, p. 93.

what messianic concepts can be discovered therein. That these concepts took numerous forms is to be expected. Cadbury writes:

> . . . the figure of Jesus is the center of many different lines of interest which became explicit in the traditions about him. Various aspects of his significance are distinctly reflected in our records, as the white rays of the sun are divided into many colors when passing through a prism. His identification as the Messiah is sometimes asserted and sometimes corrected. It is attested by fulfillment of Scripture, by voices from heaven and by witness of demons and of men. A literal anointing is told, whether in water or in the Spirit, in tears or in spikenard. The miracles that he wrought and those that accompanied his birth and resurrection were valued as evidences. To predict what subsequently came to pass, to control Nature, to triumph over disease, especially over demons and death, were confirmations of his Messianic office. The same evidences served to ratify also other synonymous or similar titles, as Son of God, son of David, prophet, Savior or Lord. For some of them, however, other more literal evidences were more appropriate, as physical descent from David or from God. Behind other synoptic passages lies the question of the relation of Davidic sonship, Lordship and Messiahship, and the identification of the expected forerunner Elijah with the actual forerunner John. Interests like these were doubtless an uninterrupted *motif* in the re-telling of his life.[1]

One point in which the *kerygma* is uniform is the proclamation that the Messiah is Jesus. This is not only true of the *kerygma* at the New Testament level but there is every

---

1. MLA, pp. 39-40.

reason to believe that this item formed a part of the _kerygma_ argument from the first. But how did this item function in the argument?

It may be well to note, first of all, the arguments used to prove the Messiahship of Jesus. In Acts 2:14-40 the argument seems to hinge on the resurrection and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The apostles had witnessed Jesus' resurrection. It was predicted in the Scriptures that the messiah would rise and be at the right hand of God, therefore the Messiah is Jesus. The Holy Spirit was promised to the Messiah and has now been poured out upon the apostles, therefore the Last Days have come. A quotation from Psalm 110 reenforces the need for repentance.

The argument in Acts 3:12-26 appeals also to the resurrection and Scripture in much the same manner, but, in addition, the power of the Name of Jesus to produce miracles appears to add force to the argument. The same is true in Acts 4:8-12 and 24-30. Again in Acts 5:20-42 the resurrection and Holy Spirit prove Jesus' Messiahship.

How Philip shows from the portion of Isaiah 53 quoted in Acts 8:31-37 that it applies to Jesus, or what conclusions he draws from the connection is not clear, but at least the practice of appealing to the Old Testament to interpret Jesus is evident here.

Alongside of the arguments from Scripture and Jesus' resurrection Peter places the anointing of Jesus with the

Holy Spirit (at baptism?) and His healing miracles. To the same line of argument in Acts 13:6-46, is added the testimony of John the Baptist to the coming Messiah.

Paul's argument in Acts 17:2-3 is of the same kind: The Scriptures have predicted that the messiah must die and rise again. This Jesus has done. Therefore He is the Messiah. The resurrection is the sole evidence for Jesus' Messiahship in Acts 17:22-31; while in 18:28, it is simply the Scriptures that are mentioned. John the Baptist's testimony is cited again in Acts 19:4.

In the two speeches in which Paul recounts his conversion experience (Acts 22:1-21; 26:2-27), the argument for Jesus' Messiahship rests on Paul's vision of the exalted Jesus.[1] In the second of these, however, the conformity of the death and resurrection to Scriptural prophecy is adduced as an added argument. Probably, also, Paul's argument in Acts 28:23 "from the law of Moses and from the Prophets" is to be understood as in the same vein.

In Romans 1:1-6, conformity of both Davidic descent and the resurrection to Scriptural prediction seems to comprise the proof of Jesus' Messiahship. "The prophetic writings" in some way disclose the "mystery" of Jesus Christ in Romans 16:25-26. Probably Paul is alluding here to the same line of thought as in 1:1-6.

---

1. This may be Luke's purpose also in Stephen's vision, Acts 7:55-56.

The "demonstration of the Spirit and power" were the proofs used to convert the Corinthians according to I Corinthians 2:2-5. Undoubtedly this is the same sort of argument as the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in Acts already noted.

I Corinthians 15:1-15 reflects the argument of the conformity of Jesus' death and resurrection to Scriptural predictions. II Corinthians 4:4-14, on the other hand, seems to indicate a subjective argument in the words, "Who has shone in our hearts".

Apparently Paul assumes that the Colossians had received Jesus as the Messiah "through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:12). Again in I Thessalonians 1:5, power, the Holy Spirit, and "full conviction" figure as proofs of the gospel, i.e. that the Messiah is Jesus, etc.

It appears also in I Thessalonians 1:9-10 that the Thessalonian Christians had turned from idols because Jesus had been raised from the dead and was therefore waiting to return from heaven in the parousia.

What the words "vindicated in the Spirit" mean in I Timothy 3:16 is not entirely clear but most likely they refer to a witness of the Holy Spirit to the Messiahship of Jesus. In II Timothy 1:8-12 the purpose and grace of God has been manifested in the "appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 1:10). The following clause seems clearly

to refer to the death and resurrection as the key to the manifestation. Verse 8 of the next chapter refers to the resurrection and Davidic descent in connection with the Messiah Jesus but it is not clear that this was the basis for an argument for Jesus' Messiahship.

The argument of I Peter 1:10-12, it seems clear, rests on the ancient predictions of the sufferings and "subsequent glory" of the messiah.

The characteristic argument in the kerygma for Jesus' Messiahship appears to be that the Scriptures had predicted the messiah would die and be raised again; this had happened to Jesus, therefore, He is the Messiah. The argument began, therefore, with the resurrection. The appeal to the Scriptures was a necessary second step. To this was added several supporting arguments such as the continuing power of the Name of Jesus to produce miracles when used by the apostles; the claim of Davidic ancestry for Jesus; the witness of John the Baptist; the bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the believer.

Doubtless these arguments were expanded and developed as time went on but the initial pattern of argument outlined here most probably developed very early and quickly, so that, for all practical purposes it may be regarded as coeval with the kerygma. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, some conception of the resurrection would be necessary to allow the belief in Jesus'

Messiahship to survive the crucifixion. In the second place, the fact that the kerygma made its first appeal to Jews and that the whole messianic idea was inexorably related to the Scriptures would make the appeal to the Scriptures almost immediately necessary. In the third place, the a priori likelihood of the appeal to the miraculous use of the Name and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit being a late development is very small. In the Fourth place, the appearance of this pattern of argument in all three levels of the evidence seems to indicate that it remained quite constant throughout and most probably lay at the very base of the kerygma.

The place of John the Baptist's testimony in the original pattern--which, in any case, is of slight importance--is not so certain. Elsewhere in the New Testament other evidences of the Messiahship of Jesus are brought forward, as the above quotation from Cadbury points out, but, at least so far as the kerygma is concerned, such evidences are supplemental to this basic pattern.

It is apparent that this pattern of argument brings the concept of the messiah into certain rather definite limits. The idea of the resurrection made possible a unique combination of the Davidic messiah and Enoch Son of Man.[1] This combination is made possible by a third messianic concept which is probably peculiar to Christianity

---

1. Cf. Schweitzer, MPA, pp. 82-83.

--that of the "Suffering Servant".[1] The great messianic act upon which the eschaton depends is reserved for the risen Christ and has been made possible by His suffering and resurrection. Jesus' earthly experience apparently was not for the purpose of establishing the kingdom, but was in some way to announce it and to die and be raised to the right hand of God so as to be ready for the parousia.

Care must be taken not to over-simplify the problem of early Christian messianic thought or to impose upon the evidence a unity and coherence that does not really exist. What actually formed the base from which the early Christian preachers started was the way in which the resurrection allowed them to continue to believe in and proclaim the Messiah as Jesus after the crucifixion. This obviously required some such concepts of messianism as are involved in the Enoch Son of Man. Hence some of the titles that appear in the evidence are reminiscent of the Similitudes.

On the other hand, as Cadbury points out, the political aspect of messianism was not altogether absent.[2] Doubtless, some such notions were present in the kerygma, for even a transcendental eschatology would not be altogether unrelated to the political problems of the day. The

---

1. See Charles, IV Ezra, p. 284. Also Drummond, JM, p. 359. There seems to be no good reason to associate the Christian idea of the Suffering Messiah with Messiah ben Joseph. See: Cohen, ET, pp. 369-370.

2. MLA, p. 278.

actual term, Messiah (Christ), is the one most frequently applied to Jesus. This term belongs most naturally in the Davidic-political area of messianic ideas. The second most frequent messianic term in the kerygma evidence is the word, Lord. Although the term was used in the mystery cults, it is hard to escape its connection with theocratic ideas and political messianic hopes.[1] The word, King, is also used of Jesus once in the kerygma (Acts 17:7). The term, Servant, may well reflect the Suffering Servant theory of Isaiah.

Definite evidence for the development of Christological thought in the New Testament lies outside the kerygma evidence. This may be significant or it may be due to statistical accident. It is interesting, for instance, to note that Paul's doctrine of preexistence does not appear in his references to his preaching. There is a sense in which the idea of messianic preexistence may have been present in the kerygma. There were two ideas of preexistence in Jewish thought. One was a supernatural, eternal type such as appears in connection with Enoch's Son of Man.[2] The other was a kind of earthly preexistence in which the messiah was to live a hidden, or at least obscure, life until the time for his revelation arrived.[3]

---

1. Dodd, ATS, pp. 120-21.

2. Enoch 46:1-3; 48:2-6.

3. Singer, JE, Vol. VIII, p. 511. Cf. Moore, Judiasm, Vol. II, pp. 348-49.

This latter idea would be useful to apostolic Christianity and may be reflected in Mark's "Messianic secret". In this case, the entire earthly ministry would be a kind of preexistence and the revelation would become possible only after the resurrection. Supernatural preexistence (not a part of the kerygma, apparently) would, then, represent a line of later development.

Insofar as it is possible to infer from the New Testament evidence what lay back of it, it may be concluded that the apostolic preachers argued, as did Jesus, for repentance and a new ethical relationship to God and reinforced their argument by means of the imminence of the eschaton. But since the "proof" of this was the Messiahship of Jesus, the predominate factor in the argument was Jesus rather than the eschaton. The proclamation that "the Messiah is Jesus" was sufficient evidence for the urgent need to repent without an elaboration of the accompanying eschatological factors. The proof that the Messiah was Jesus consisted basically of a theory based on the resurrection which found in the Old Testament a series of predictions that the messiah would come from the royal lineage of David (at least in some cases), would be killed, but would rise again to become the heavenly "Son of Man" poised ready to return in final judgment and establish the kingdom of God.

It should be pointed out that it is highly improbable that the resurrection originated the belief in Jesus'

Messiahship.[1] It would be more accurate to say that the persistent confidence in Jesus' Messiahship found the idea of the resurrection a highly necessary and useful way of proving what had already been held as a settled conviction. But that conviction, of course, may have grown out of inferences drawn from Jesus' preaching of repentance because of the nearness of the kingdom of God.

Thus by means of a claim of transcendental Messiahship supported by the belief in His resurrection, Jesus' ethical message was perpetuated by His followers in a *kerygma* which, though it undoubtedly developed along many different lines in different localities and under different circumstances, retained Jesus at its core.

3. The Crucifixion and Resurrection in the Kerygma

Although a number of points to be dealt with in the remainder of this chapter have been touched on in the preceding section, it remains now to examine them at greater length to see what evidence can be had which will help to account for the development of the *kerygma* into the forms in which it is found in the New Testament.

Reference was made in Chapter III to the significance of concomitant items for this study.[2] While there is no

---

1. See Taylor, JHS, pp. 19-20.

2. Above, p. 35.

case of complete concomitance, there are two items that do appear together with sufficient frequency to merit consideration. If the resurrection and exaltation be regarded as representing essentially the same idea, there are sixteen instances in which the crucifixion and resurrection appear together. The crucifixion appears nine times without the resurrection and the resurrection appears seven times alone.

It is apparent throughout the evidence that the two items were always thought of together. Even where only the crucifixion is mentioned the resurrection is assumed. Since the crucifixion is one of the three most frequent items in the evidence, this concomitance may be assumed to have been of primary importance.

The centrality of the crucifixion and resurrection in the kerygma needs hardly to be argued. Dodd finds it to be the "historical section" of the kerygma and Dibelius limits the term, kerygma, to just this "formula".[1] What is important for this study is to inquire into its reasons for being there, its function in the argument, and any clues it may provide for the development of the kerygma.

It is obvious that so long as the kerygma retained Jesus as its starting point, "His death also had to be accounted for. Before it was converted into an asset it was

---

1. AP, pp. 17, 47. FTG, pp. 17-19.

at least a liability, a stumbling-block to be explained".[1] It will not do simply to dismiss this phase of development by saying that "if there was such a period, it is a period to which we have no access".[2] In any attempt to account for the kerygma, the possibility and significance of such a period in its development must be reckoned with.

Although Jesus may have believed Himself to be the Messiah and may have anticipated His death by providing His disciples with predictions and interpretations thereof, as Vincent Taylor has forcefully argued,[3] there is evidence that, in some quarters at least, the cross was first of all "a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles" (I Cor. 1:23). Perhaps the apostles from the outset associated the crucifixion with certain positive religious values but they were, nevertheless, confronted in their proclamation of the message with hearers for whom the crucifixion was of purely negative significance. The influence of this stage in the history of the kerygma is still evident as late as the time of Luke. For him, when compared with the resurrection,

> . . . the death of Jesus has little evidential value . . . It is curious how it is treated in the speeches of Acts. The death of Jesus was an act of ignorant wickedness and rejection on the part of

---

1. Cadbury, MLA, p. 40.

2. Dodd, ATS, p. 123.

3. JHS, esp. pp. 254-73.

> the Jews. God, however, thwarted its effect by raising Jesus from the dead. The resurrection is therefore the significant thing about Jesus. His death is only the prelude. The resurrection is the great fulfilment of prophecy, the demonstration of Messiahship, the occasion for repentance in view of a coming judgment and resurrection for all mankind.[1]

One example will serve to illustrate Luke's understanding of the situation in the first years of the Church. In the familiar account of Gamaliel's advice to the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:34-39), two messianic pretenders, Theudas and Judas, are mentioned.[2] Both were slain, after which their followers were scattered and their movements failed. The test of whether such a movement is of men or of God cannot be the death of the messianic claimant, for Jesus had already been crucified. The argument seems to hinge rather on the survival of the movement in spite of the execution of its leader. Although Luke has placed this argument in the mouth of Gamaliel, it must have been closely related in his mind with the argument of the primitive <u>kerygma</u>.

Strange to say, the development of more positive meanings in the preaching of the crucifixion is found in the earliest strand of evidence, the writings of Paul. In contrast to Paul's interpretation of the crucifixion, the primitive

---

1. Cadbury, MLA, p. 280.

2. Luke's error in chronology is not important for this point.

quality in Luke's account--which has been noticed before in this chapter[1]--becomes evident. This may, of course, be "due to Luke's accurate information and . . . not composed by him out of his own imagination, but it is also possible that Luke himself had a very similar viewpoint, even though he lived long after".[2] If the latter is true, it is another evidence of the complexity of kerygma development which did not run in a simple, linear series of changes, but developed rapidly in some quarters, perhaps under the pressure of circumstances, while remaining relatively primitive in others.

The meaning of the crucifixion of Jesus for the kerygma can probably best be seen by observing the subsequent claims for Him that are placed in contrast with it.

In Acts 2:14-40, Jesus was crucified but He was resurrected and made Messiah. In Acts 3:12-26, He was raised, His miraculous power continued, His passion was foretold in the Scriptures, and heaven had received Him until the time for His return arrives. Acts 4:8-12 adds to the resurrection and continuing of Jesus' miraculous power, the claim that He, as "the Stone which was rejected by you builders, . . . has become the head of the corner" (4:11). The predestination of the messiah to death, as manifested in the Scriptures, and the continuation of miraculous deeds by

1. Above, p. 112.

2. Cadbury, MLA, pp. 281-82.

means of the Name are the answers to the crucifixion in Acts 4:24-30. Acts 5:28-30 contrasts Jesus' crucifixion with His resurrection and exaltation at the right hand of God "as Leader and Savior."

Stephen says nothing about the resurrection in his speech (Acts 7:1-53) but his description of his vision testifies to Jesus' exaltation. Any idea of positive value in the crucifixion is noticeably absent here. The resurrection and ordination to be the future "judge of the living and the dead" (10:42) is the antithesis of the Crucifixion in Acts 10:34-43. The resurrection in accordance with Scriptural prediction turns the defeat of the cross into victory for Jesus in Acts 13:6-41. The same is true in Acts 17:2-3 and 26:2-27.

Paul argues, in I Corinthians 1:23-24, that although the cross is "a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles", it is "to those who are called. . . the power of God and the wisdom of God". Evidently here again the continuation of Jesus' power represents His triumph over the cross. In I Corinthians 15:1-15, the theme, familiar in Acts is found again. The announcement that Christ was raised from the dead and that it all happened in accordance with Scriptural prediction overcomes the liability of the cross. The phrase, "for our sins" (vs. 3), indicates the rise of attempts to explain why the messiah must die.

A more positive religious value begins to appear in the

interpretations of the cross in II Corinthians 4:4-14; 5:11-21; Galatians 2:14-21; Colossians 1:21-23; 2:6-15. Here, in line with his Christ-mysticism, Paul finds the explanation of the cross in the identification of the believer with the dying and rising again of Jesus which effects an ethical regeneration in the believer. But this interpretation clearly assumes the resurrection and its prediction in the Scriptures, rather than replaces it, as the answer to the crucifixion. The last of the above passages adds the further interpretation that in His death and resurrection, Jesus "disarmed the principalities and powers . . . triumphing over them" (vs. 15).

When I Thessalonians 1:10 and 2:15 are taken together the same reasoning as that found in Acts appears again. The resurrection, exaltation and imminent parousia answer the defeat of the crucifixion.

The crucifixion becomes the means by which the Messiah Jesus "abolished death and brought life and immortality to light" in II Timothy 1:10, while in 2:2-13, triumph through suffering is declared to be the meaning of Jesus' death, and in that triumph, He becomes an example for the believer.

I Peter 1:10-12 answers the problem of the cross by pointing to Jesus' "subsequent glory" which, with His sufferings, was predicted by the prophets.

The treatment of the crucifixion apparent in the kerygma evidence may be summarized as follows:

He was crucified but--

He was not guilty.

He was resurrected and/or exalted to be the Lord of Glory and He will return.

His power continues through the use of His Name and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

His crucifixion was in the plan of God as is evident by being predicted in the Scriptures.

It was for our sins.

He thereby abolished death.

He became an example of triumph through suffering and guarantee of the believer's survival of death.

There appears in this part of the kerygma argument a definite line of development. Beginning with the protest of Jesus' innocence of anything deserving of death and the assertion that, in spite of the wicked deed by which He was killed, He was raised from the dead and/or exalted to the right hand of God from whence He will come as the Messiah, the argument took on interpretations that included several more positive values in the crucifixion. Among these are His triumph over demonic powers including death itself, a vicarious expiation "for our sins", an example of achieving eternal life through suffering.

The line of this development cannot be determined by

the order of its appearance in the documents. As has already been noted, the earliest documents and the latest in date of writing manifest the most development of positive value in the crucifixion. Acts throughout appears to be the most primitive. It is interesting to observe that this positive development appears in documents that are either Pauline or on other grounds manifest Pauline influence.

Another interesting fact about the development of thought about the cross is that the various interpretations of its meaning do not supplant each other or the basic assertion that the resurrection overcame its evil effect. Rather, these interpretations seem to build on this assertion.

Before summarizing the discussion of this section, it will be worthwhile to notice the development that took place in the thought of the resurrection itself. Whether the resurrection was originally thought of as a return to earth or was synonymous with the ascension and therefore placed Jesus directly at the right hand of God from whence His earthly appearances were made must remain an open question.[1] But at least one strand of thought found in the resurrection--whatever its nature--a vindication of Jesus' Messiahship by overcoming the liability of the crucifixion and

---

1. Cadbury, Art. (1953), p. 3f. The direct ascension seems to be implied in Paul's discussion of Jesus' appearance to him in I Cor. 15. Cf. Lk. 24:26.

placing Him in a position for the _parousia_. At this point the resurrection of the believer is only indirectly associated with that of Jesus since it is the arrival of the _eschaton_ that brings about the resurrection of the faithful dead.

But it is apparent from Paul's argument from his _kerygma_ in I Corinthians 15, as well as from such passages as II Timothy 2:11, that Jesus' resurrection soon came to mean the guarantee of the believer's resurrection. It is quite likely that this is to be associated with the idea that Jesus had "abolished death" (II Tim. 1:10).

The order of development in this section of the _kerygma_ can only be inferred from the _a priori_ likelihood of certain ideas being more primitive than others. It is, for instance, most probable that the tendency in Acts to view the crucifixion as a purely negative value and to place the accent on the resurrection is primary. The practice of finding in the Scriptures predictions that exactly this death and resurrection was to be the fate of the messiah undoubtedly began very early. The development in this case would consist of amassing a larger and more effective body of proof-texts for that purpose.

The distinction between the resurrection and ascension probably developed from the elaboration of the post-resurrection appearances, and the like, as evidences of Jesus' resurrection. The idea of His position at the right hand of God would be an almost inevitable counterpart of His Messiah-

ship. This would account for the notion of the parousia. Probably among the very earliest arguments in the kerygma was the evidential value of the "Power of the Name" and the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. The plea of Jesus' innocence would, likewise, most certainly be early.

Even though it could be proven to the satisfaction of the early Christians that the messiah's death and resurrection was predicted in the Scriptures and was therefore a part of the Divine plan, the question was bound to be asked sooner or later: Why must this be the fate of the messiah? To answer such questions as this, the ideas developed which gave the kerygma a more positive approach to the problem of the crucifixion.

4. Supporting Arguments in the Kerygma

It has been shown in the preceding section that two of the arguments advanced to meet the problem of Jesus' crucifixion were: 1. It was foretold in the Scriptures; 2. Jesus' power continues through the use of His Name and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

These two arguments appear to have formed the basis for the supporting evidence which the early preachers used in arguing their claim that the Messiah was Jesus. There were, of course, other arguments, as the items in the category, "Background anticipating Jesus" indicate. But these latter

are for the most part either related to or dependent upon the former.

The whole category of the background appears to have two functions in the kerygma. The first is to provide an argument from a basis accepted in common by the preacher and his hearers. This is evident in such phrases as "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly" (Acts 2:36), which follows the argument from Psalm 16:8-11 and Psalm 132:11 to prove the resurrection of the messiah; "And all the prophets who have spoken . . . also proclaimed these days" (Acts 3:24); and "they did not recognize him nor understand the utterances of the prophets which are read every Sabbath" (Acts 13:27).[1]

The second function is to provide the proclamation of Jesus with an authoritatively respectable past and thus avoid the charge that the kerygma was a novel, and therefore ill-founded, idea. This is evidently the purpose, for instance, of recitations of Hebrew history in Acts 7 and 13. Jesus is simply the final manifestation of the eternal purpose of God which is evident in the whole history of Israel. According to Stephen, this same history helps to explain the rejection of the kerygma since there were those throughout Israel's history who were willfully blind to God's will.

---

1. See also such phrases as, "to him all the prophets bear witness" (Acts 10:43). Cf. 3:18; 15:15; 17:2-3; 18:28; 26:22; 28:23; Rom. 1:2; I Cor. 15:3-4.

This connection of Jesus with the eternal program of God is brought out by Luke in the setting he gives for Paul's speech on the Areopagus. Luke introduces the occasion by having Paul invited to speak by those who "spent their time in nothing except telling or hearing something new" (Acts 17:21). Paul's speech which follows emphasizes that the "God who made the world and everything in it", though He overlooked "the times of ignorance", "now commands all men everywhere to repent". Paul's doctrine, therefore, only appears to be novel. Actually, although it was obscured by man's ignorance, it is the eternal purpose of God.

Both of these motives seem to be present in Paul's reference to the apocalyptic "mystery" in Romans 16:25-26 and Ephesians 3:9. At least the second of these motives, the eternal continuity of the advent of Jesus, is present in the words, "ages ago" in II Timothy 1:9 and Titus 1:2, and in the reference to the prophets in I Peter 1:10-12.

Insofar as the <u>kerygma</u> evidence is concerned, it is the evidential value of the Scriptures that is emphasized rather than any aid the Scriptures might provide for interpreting the meaning of Jesus' advent.[1] Undoubtedly the use of the Scriptures helped to expand the "facts" about Jesus but it

1. Cf. Dodd, ATS, p. 27.

is difficult and beyond the scope of this study to determine where and in how far this took place.[1]

A considerable number of passages refer to the Scriptural predictions as proof of Jesus' fulfillment of the plan of God without any indication of what Scriptures are being referred to.[2] It appears to be taken for granted that the reader knows what those Scriptures are.

A distinction has been made in this study between the appeal to Scriptural predictions and the recital of Hebrew history. This is because the argument in each case takes a somewhat different form. The predictions draw upon a common basis of agreement and emphasize specific predictions while the history provides, as has just been shown, a respectable past without any emphasis on the prediction factor.

Four times in Acts the preacher is represented as speaking to people for whom the Hebrew Scriptures held no authority or were not known. This is represented in the charts as the item, "Appeal to Natural Reason" (14:15-17; 17:22-31; 19:26; 24:24-25). In the first two of these passages God, Who created all things, is proclaimed to be in control of history and is now commanding all men to turn to

---

1. It may well be, for instance, that such passages as Isa. 53 played a large part in the development of the positive values in the kerygma described in the previous section.

2. See Acts 3:28; 7:52; 10:43; 13:27; 17:2-3, etc.

Him. The reason that He has not previously been known among the nations is found in His long-suffering permission of "all the nations to walk in their own ways" (14:16). But the time has now arrived for all men to repent (17:30). It may be inferred that the argument in the latter two passages is of the same kind.

Three motives are in evidence here. One is to place the kerygma in a continuity that goes back to creation itself. This gospel is no "new thing".[1] The second motive is closely related to the first. Since the command to repent comes from the God "who made heaven and earth", it applies to all nations who dwell thereon. The question as to why the gentiles should obey the Jewish God has thus been anticipated. This makes the kerygma universal in its application. The third motive is the quite natural quest for a common basis from which to argue.

That this picture of the kerygma presented by Luke has a strong likelihood of being true can be seen from the similarity it bears to Paul's argument in Romans 1:18ff.

There are two other items in the category, "Background Anticipating Jesus". The claim of Davidic ancestry for Jesus is a form of the same argument as the fulfillment of Scriptural predictions. It was manifestly used to appeal

---

1. Cf. Luke's genealogical table (Lk. 3:23-28) which traces Jesus' lineage back to God.

to those who believed in a Davidic messiah and served to show that Jesus was the fulfillment of such predictions.

The references to John the Baptist seem to have been made in order to appeal to followers of the John the Baptist sect. John is here made to point his hearers to Jesus (Acts 13:25; 19:4), or at least to have functioned as Jesus' predecessor (Acts 10:37).

"The Command to Preach", in the category, "His Cosmic Significance", follows quite naturally from the claim that Jesus' advent was in fulfillment of the eternal plan of God. It was a part of that plan that this appeal for repentance and faith should be made to all men since the coming judgment and eschaton would involve the whole cosmos.

It may be inferred from the motivations for these items that their development in the kerygma was not linear but that they arose quite naturally when and where the circumstances called for them. There may have been others which have disappeared because circumstances made them unnecessary and which had dropped out of the kerygma while the latter was still in the pre-literary period.

The practice of appealing to Scriptural predictions probably began immediately with the kerygma. This is also probably the case with the recital of Israel's history and the claim of Davidic ancestry for Jesus. In the case of these two items, however, there was probably little, if any, development. Luke's use of them in Acts indicates their

persistence in the kerygma, but there was little room for development. Undoubtedly, anyone brought up under the discipline of the synagogue could have recited such a summary of history extemporaneously, and, unless the Matthean and Lucan genealogies are judged to be an evidence of it, the claim of Jesus' Davidic descent in the kerygma shows no development but simply appears or disappears according to the circumstances.

The Scriptural predictions, on the other hand, would inevitably be subject to a long process of elaboration. The use of specific Scriptural passages in the kerygma evidence is too scanty to allow any reconstruction of the way in which this development took place, and the details of this development are not of sufficient importance to the conclusions of this study to merit further discussion.[1] The point here is to observe the function of this item in the argument of the kerygma and the flexibility by means of which the items in these categories were able to meet their circumstances.

The idea that the kerygma was applicable to all men without regard to nationality appears to have been argued

---

1. Dodd's recent study of this problem, based on a modification of Rendall Harris' hypothesis "that a collection of 'messianic proof-texts' was compiled at a very early date", works out the answer principally by a comparison of the Scriptures used independently by more than one writer in the New Testament. This process takes him through all the New Testament documents. ATS, p. 23ff. Cf. Harris, Rendel, Testimonies, (2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916-20).

in the Christian community on the pragmatic basis of the success of the gentile mission (Acts 10:34-35, 45-47; 15:8), but this was probably not the origin of the idea.

That the idea of universalism was present in apocalyptic thought has already been observed.[1] It was also present in the Prophets, particularly Isaiah, one of the early Christians' favorite sources for Scriptural quotations.[2] It may be conjectured that this prophetic and apocalyptic background was influential in the development of this item.[3] Whatever Jesus' own attitude in the matter may have been, it is certain from the prominence of the controversy over circomcision in the New Testament that universalism was not a part of primitive Christian thought in all quarters and, therefore, probably not always a part of the kerygma. The well-known difficulties of the Christians in the synagogues and their subsequent separation therefrom, coupled with the enthusiasm with which the gentile God-fearers received their message, may well have sent them back to the Scriptures for texts which helped them develop this theory. The logic of the cosmic claims made for Jesus' Messiahship would, of course, figure in this development.

The second supporting argument in answer to the problem

---

1. Above, p. 134.

2. Cf. Isa. 49:6, et al.

3. Cf. Dodd, AP, pp. 112-13.

of the crucifixion, as has been said, was from the pragmatic evidence of the power to work wonders by the use of Jesus' Name and the gift of the Holy Spirit. An examination of the references to both of these items in the category, "His Effect on Believers", will show that, at least according to the evidence, they were pointed out in the kerygma more as evidence of the truth and power of the gospel than as inducements to accept it, though the latter would certainly be implied.[1] If it assumed that this miraculous and fervid period suffered an early decline, then these items must have taken their place in the kerygma as a part of the historical element.

It is the third item in this category, "Forgiveness of Sins", that was advanced as an inducement to repentance and belief.

There is no reason to doubt that this item was coeval with the kerygma and there is little evidence of development except in its connection with the growth of concepts of positive values in the crucifixion noted in the preceding section. This item is closely connected with "The Appeal".

With the exception of this last, the items under discussion in this section were developed to support the claim

---

1. See Acts 2:15-16, 33; 3:16; 4:10, 30; 5:32; 10:45; 15:8; I Cor. 2:4-5; I Thess. 1:5. On the other hand, I Pet. 1:12 refers to the Holy Spirit as the source of power by which the kerygma was proclaimed. Cf. Acts 2:38.

of Jesus' Messiahship. Those contained in the categories, "Background Anticipating Jesus" and "His Cosmic Significance", are concerned to establish Jesus' place at the climax of God's eternal program of activity in the world. No one should have been surprised that the Messiah Jesus came as he did, was crucified and was resurrected to the right hand of God to await the time for the parousia. It was all foretold in the Scriptures and followed inevitably upon the providential history of Israel. John the Baptist stood in this line of divine history as Jesus' predecessor. Jesus' connection with this history is evident in the fact that He descended from the royal lineage of David.

That all men are obligated to hear and respond to this kerygma is due to the fact that God is not simply a Jewish divinity but the Creator under Whose providential care the whole world lives. Not all these items, of course, appeared in any one instance of the kerygma. But they were developed and used as the occasion demanded.

All of these were a part of the developing argument to prove that the time in God's cosmic program had arrived when repentance and a new ethical relation to Him was urgently necessary for all men. The Messiah has come, therefore repent!

5. Eschatology and the Kerygma

If the description of the *kerygma* thus far advanced in this study is valid, it is clear that one its important concerns is to keep the threat of coming judgment and the prospect of coming blessedness contained in the idea of the *eschaton* sufficiently alive to provide an adequate ethical motivation.[1] But to say this is to approach the problem of eschatology from the opposite end from that of Dodd's study. That is to say, the *kerygma*, rather than being "a proclamation of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in an eschatological setting from which those facts derive their saving significance", is a proclamation of those facts in such a way as to retrieve the "eschatological setting" for ethical purposes, which was threatened by the crucifixion.[2]

In this case, the crucifixion and the resurrection are not, as Dodd claims, "in themselves an eschatological process, that is . . . a decisive manifestation of the mighty acts of God for the salvation of man".[3] Rather, taken together, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus become, at

---

1. Cadbury, Art. (1953), p. 28.

2. Dodd, AP, p. 24.

3. AP, p. 42. This, in essence, is Dodd's theory of "realized eschatology".

the hands of the apostolic preachers, proof that His message is still valid, i.e., that repentance is urgently due because the eschaton is at hand.

The eschatological factor in the kerygma, at all events, demands to be dealt with in such a study as this. Aside from the place of an imminent eschatology in the appeal for repentance, the idea of a messiah itself is eschatological. There is no room here, of course, to enter into the whole problem of the wide variety of eschatological ideas in the New Testament. It will only be necessary to note the forms which eschatological thought takes in the kerygma and observe their function therein.

The antecedent of apostolic preaching, i.e., the preaching of Jesus Himself, laid down the pattern of eschatological motivation for repentance in the proclamation of the "kingdom of God". This term, of course, presents some well-known difficulties. It may be questioned, for instance, whether Jesus meant this term to refer to the messianic kingdom. It is difficult to argue for such a reference from the background of apocalyptic or rabbinic usage. Drummond remarks that,

> . . . at all events in the purely Jewish literature, there is no satisfactory evidence that 'the kingdom of God,' or 'the kingdom of heaven,' was ever used by the Jews as synonymous with the kingdom of the Messiah.[1]

---

1. Drummond, JM, p. 322.

Of course, it does not follow by any means that the term, kingdom of God, could not have been so used by Jesus and/or elsewhere in the New Testament. Charles contends that the term is in fact eschatological:

> . . . we must maintain that the phrase "kingdom of God" is used eschatologically and signifies "the divine community in which the will of God will be perfectly realized."[1]

It may also be contended that Jesus had subjected the term "to his mode of searching scrutiny" and thus escaped all the current eschatological connotations it may have borne.[2] But the fact remains that His post-resurrection followers did not so take it. The place the kingdom of God occupies in the Acts <u>kerygma</u> alongside other clearly eschatological terms is sufficient evidence that it was understood eschatologically.

The eschatology of the <u>kerygma</u> was always futuristic. The <u>eschaton</u> was proclaimed as imminent but never as realized. This was the point of using it in the argument of the <u>kerygma</u>. As an act of God lying in the near future it became a strong means of applying moral pressure upon the hearers. If the primacy of ethical motives in the <u>kerygma</u> be allowed and the significance of the connection between

---

1. Charles, DNT, p. 48.

2. Sharman, SOM, pp. 135-36.

the crucifixion and the resurrection is as described in the previous section, then the latter cannot possibly be viewed as actual eschatological events but rather as a guarantee of the coming of the eschaton and Jesus' association therewith.[1]

Any student of the kerygma is under obligation to deal with the hypothesis of "realized eschatology" because Dodd has found this hypothesis to provide the meaning of the kerygma.[2] According to him, it is chiefly in this matter of eschatology that the development which took place in the kerygma is to be found.[3]

It is not altogether clear at some points what Dodd means by "realized" eschatology. It appears at times to imply an allegorical treatment by the apostolic preachers of apocalyptic ideas in which they

> . . . have deliberately, boldly, and consistently applied those ideas and that language to the facts of the ministry, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The implication is that in those facts all that the prophets meant by the Day of the Lord is realized. There is here a Divine event, unique and decisive, in which the whole purpose of God in history is made manifest.[4]

---

1. This portion of the study, where not otherwise indicated, is in large measure dependent upon the writer's unpublished manuscript, "The Messiah in Apostolic Preaching", 1953.

2. AP, p. 24.

3. AP, pp. 32, 35, 36ff.

4. AP, p. 87. Cf. PK, pp. 104-05.

At other times Dodd admits that there is a futuristic element that is not included in the "realized eschatology".

> While, however, the New Testament affirms with full seriousness that the great divine event has happened, there remains a residue of eschatology which is not exhausted in the "realized eschatology" of the Gospel, namely, the element of sheer finality. . . Thus the idea of a second coming of Christ appears along with the emphatic assertion that His coming in history satisfies all the conditions of the eschatological event, except that of absolute finality.[1]

In fact, at several points he notes that the actual *parousia*, the "consummation of the age", from the perspective of the preachers, lies still in the future.[2] Indeed, it is this very fact that causes one line of development in the kerygma to run up a "blind alley".[3] This hypothesis, therefore, at no point succeeds in accounting for all the elements of eschatology present in the *kerygma*.

There is a remarkable similarity between Dodd's description of "realized eschatology" and Schweitzer's description of Paul's version of "thoroughgoing eschatology". Dodd says:

> The more we try to penetrate in imagination to the state of mind of the first

---

1. AP, p. 93.

2. AP, pp. 13, 23, 63, etc. At one point he seems to imply that "realized eschatology" in the full sense is actually a development. See p. 65.

3. AP, p. 41.

> Christians in the earliest days, the more are we driven to think of resurrection, exaltation, and second advent as being, in their belief, inseparable parts of a single divine event. It was not an early advent that they proclaimed, but an immediate advent. They proclaimed it not so much as a future event for which men should prepare by repentance, but rather as the impending corroboration of a present fact: the new age is already here, and because it is here men should repent. The proof that it was here was found in the actual presence of the Spirit, that is, of the supernatural in the experience of men. It was in a supernatural world that the apostles felt themselves to be living. . .[1]

Schweitzer describes Paul's eschatology in the following words:

> While other believers held that the finger of the world-clock was touching on the beginning of the coming hour and were waiting for the stroke which should announce this, Paul told them that it had already passed beyond the point, and that they had failed to hear the striking of the hour, which in fact struck at the Resurrection of Jesus.
>
> Behind the apparently immobile outward show of the natural world, its transformation into the supernatural was in progress, as the transformation of a stage goes on behind the curtain.
>
> . . . .
>
> During that world-period between the Resurrection of Jesus and His Coming again the transient and the eternal worlds are intermingled. Thereby the conditions for a peculiar Mysticism are created. . . he who has the true knowledge can be conscious of himself as at one and the same time in

---

1. AP, p. 33.

> the transient world and the eternal world. He need only to realize. . . that powers of supernatural existence are engaged in so transforming him--and all about him, so far as that is its destiny--in such a way that their outward appearance is still that of the transient world while the reality is already that of the eternal world.[1]

This seems to illustrate the difficulty of escaping the literal nature of New Testament eschatological expectations.[2] Whatever may be considered to be taking place in the interval between the resurrection and the parousia, the eschaton itself still awaits that parousia.

The important objection, from the standpoint of this study, to "realized eschatology" is that, in the light of the theory of kerygma development herein maintained, such a view of eschatology misunderstands the place of the crucifixion and resurrection in the argument of the kerygma. What the apostolic preacher was most anxious to prove was not that what had happened was a part of the eschaton but rather that it was proof that repentance is urgently called for because the eschaton is imminent and because Jesus was indeed the Messiah.

---

1. Schweitzer, MPA, p. 99.

2. Dodd's statement that "it is highly suggestive that for Paul the resurrection of Christ marks the moment in history at which the new age began, and the eschatological hope came true" (PK, p. 100 n.) suggests that after all, his "realized eschatology" is little more than a reading back into apostolic times of what Schweitzer calls "permanent elements" of Paul's eschatology, Cf. MPA, pp. 376-96.

Several other objections can be urged against Dodd's hypothesis. In the first place, the question of the tense of verbs referring to the Kingdom of God, and the like, is not quite as decisively in favor of this hypothesis as Dodd seems to think.[1] Cadbury writes:

> In fact realized eschatology in the Lukan writings nowhere comes so near to a single definite expression as it does in the Q saying, If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you ahead of time (Luke xi. 20). The Greek verb here is not the usual verb 'to come' nor even 'to draw near.' The latter occurs in the past tense (ἤγγικεν) but it has not the same meaning of the future realized but rather of the future imminent. Whereas the verb 'to come' even in the present tense means future. Thus when in Luke xvii. 20-21 Jesus is asked by the Pharisees, when does the kingdom sic of God come? the verb means 'will come' or as we say futuristically also in English 'is coming.' The answer, whatever the preposition 'within you' means, is not an emphatic change of time from future to present. The tense of the Pharisees is not what Jesus corrects, but the reliance on "observation".[2]

Cadbury concludes his discussion of Dodd's hypothesis in connection with Luke by saying that "the Book of Acts does not spiritualize away the concrete eschatological hopes of Christianity. . . It retains, I am persuaded, the old

---

1. AP, p. 84-85.

2. Cadbury, Art. (1953), pp. 21-22.

and literal expectation."[1] Furthermore, several of the passages Dodd cites in his argument (AP, pp. 84-85) do not appear to be referring to the *eschaton* itself.

A second objection consists in the difficulty of such an hypothesis to explain the "correction" of certain wrong ideas which occur particularly in the Synoptic tradition. According to Dodd's hypothesis, there appear to be three stages of development in eschatological thought: 1. The belief that the *eschaton* has arrived; 2. The realization that it has not yet come and the "naive expectation" that Christ would immediately appear again to bring it; 3. The separation of the *eschaton* from the unique event of Christ's first advent and the corresponding development of faith along the lines of Christ-mysticism.[2] If, then, it is assumed that the first period in the development of New Testament eschatology is one in which the *eschaton* is believed to have already arrived, how is it possible to explain the tradition in which ideas that it was immediately to appear were corrected, not by saying that it had already appeared, but that it was yet farther in the future?

For instance, according to Luke 19:11ff, the parable of the talents was told to correct the mistaken notion "that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately." In Luke 24:13-27,

---

1. Cadbury, Art. (1953), p. 22.

2. AP, p. 34, 36-39, 63.

the wrong notion reflected in the words, "but we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel", is corrected by asking, "was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" Manifestly here the suffering and entering into glory precede, rather than are a part of, the redemption of Israel, i.e., the eschaton. The question, "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?", does not reflect any idea that the kingdom had come, nor is it corrected by such an assertion; rather it is corrected by placing the kingdom in an indefinite, although not necessarily distant, future.

Peter's rebuke of Jesus in Mark 8:31ff., and parallels, is probably to be understood as a similar wrong idea. At any rate this whole passage would be very useful to the Church by allowing it to appeal to the authority of Jesus Himself for proof that the crucifixion and resurrection are a part of the messiah's destiny. It is worthy of note that the climax of this passage (vss. 8:38-9:1) pictures a definite future apocalyptic parousia. Taken as a whole, this passage appears to be for the explicit purpose of "correcting" the wrong idea that Jesus was to usher in the kingdom immediately in a mundane fashion and of substituting for this wrong idea the belief in a futuristic apocalyptic parousia.

To be sure, it might be argued that this is an example of that development which Mark exhibits, especially in

Chapter 13, which led early Christian thought into a "blind alley".[1] The difficulty is, however, that the eschatology here coincides remarkably well with that found in Acts (1:9-11; 3:20-21) from which Dodd derives some of his most important _kerygma_ evidence. Also, how does one account for the existence of these ideas in which the kingdom is expected too soon? There is no suggestion here (Mk. 8:31ff. and parallels) that the wrong idea consisted in a belief that the _eschaton_ had come. The issue here is when and how it will come.

The fundamental difficulty with Dodd's hypothesis appears to lie in his failure to distinguish between the preliminary events that condition the coming of the _eschaton_ and the _eschaton_ itself. It is exactly the element of "sheer finality" or "residue of eschatology"[2] which is the _eschaton_. The crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, although they may represent the fulfillment of the preliminary conditions of the _eschaton_, can never have comprised the _eschaton_ itself.

However much disinclined the early Christians may have been to take too literally the "fantastic imagery of apocalyptic", they must have been considerably disappointed and surprised to be told that all that their eschatological

---

1. Dodd, AP, pp. 38, 41.

2. AP, p. 93.

hopes actually contained had been fulfilled in the ministry, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus.[1] As can be seen from the study of the eschatological references in the *kerygma* below, the essence of the *eschaton* consists in judgment for sin and blessedness for the righteous in an absolute degree. It is the fulfillment of "the demands which the conduct of men forced upon a moral God who controls history".[2] If this is true, the historical section of the *kerygma* can never be the fulfillment of the *eschaton*.

If on the other hand what Dodd means to say is that the preliminary events leading up to the *eschaton* have been fulfilled, as he seems to in the words "in its final form, it is true, the consummation of life is still a matter of hope but the earnest (*arrhabon*) of the inheritance is a present possession. . .", the crucifixion may more properly be related to the apocalyptic notion of a messianic tribulation.[3] What has been fulfilled is the necessary condition for the coming of the *eschaton*. The beginning of the end has come. "The great act of God. . . now trembled upon the verge of its conclusion in His second advent."[4] If this is what Dodd means to say, then it hardly deserves to be called

---

1. AP, p. 87.

2. Cadbury, Art. (1953), p. 28.

3. AP, p. 65. Cf. Schweitzer, MPA, p. 60ff.

4. AP, p. 34.

"realized" eschatology. For what has been "realized" is not the _eschaton_ but the conditions for its coming. To say this is to say nothing particularly new. The hypothesis maintained in this study is that the apostolic preachers appealed to the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus as evidence of the imminence of the _eschaton_. This may well be called "imminent eschatology". It does not however leave out the conclusion that the advent of Jesus was, at one point in early Christian thought at least, believed to be the realization of the beginning of the end.

It is now time to turn to the references in the category, "His Eschatological Role". The secondary nature of this category is evident in the comparatively low frequency of its occurrence in the material: Forty-five per cent as compared to seventy-two per cent in the case of Jesus' "Messianic Character".[1]

Some form of the word "salvation" occurs or is implied in thirteen instances in the total evidence. The use of this term is quite evenly distributed throughout the various strata, so that it may be regarded as belonging to the common tradition and, therefore, perhaps, early. In most cases the significance of the term seems to be taken for granted and is, therefore, difficult to determine from the context. There are, however, five instances in which some form of the word

---

1. See Table II, p. 79.

σώζω appears in contexts that provide definite clues to its meaning.

In Acts 2:14-40 the term occurs twice; the first time in the quotation from Joel 2:28-32. In this case σωθήσεται is used to translate the Hebrew מלט (which is rendered "delivered" in the original Joel passage in the RSV). The connection with the eschatological portents in the quotation here is obvious. It seems clear also that, by its connection with the Joel quotation and the reference to "this crooked generation", σώθητε in verse 40 carries the same connotation.

The connection between σωτηρίας, in Acts 13:26 and ἀφανίσθητε, in verse 41, lends probability to the assumption that the term here carries the idea of deliverance from eschatological woes, or at least the fate of the wicked in the <u>eschaton</u>.

The quotation from Isaiah 28:16 (and 8:14), which almost immediately follows the use of σωθήσῃ in Romans 10:9, is used in fuller form at the end of the previous chapter (9:33). This latter indicates what was in Paul's mind in 10:11.[1] The point of this quotation, both in its original setting and Paul's use of it in connection with the fate of

---

1. The fact that Rom. 9:33 appears to be a conflation of Isa. 28:16 and 8:14, and that it varies at points from the LXX, is not important here since the question concerns the meaning of the word "saved". The point is to discover Paul's meaning from the quotations of which he makes use. See Dodd, ATS, pp. 41-42.

Israel versus the faithful whether Jew or gentile, seems to concern the bestowal or withdrawal of God's providential care. The connection between this and eschatology lies in the fact that the eschaton is God's ultimate providential act.[1] Salvation here is not "theological" but rather concerns the gathering of a righteous, elect community which will be ready for the eschaton. Israel has, by its rejection of the Messiah Jesus, been temporarily displaced as the elect community. Meanwhile, the door has been thrown open to the gentiles. Their "salvation", therefore, consists in their inclusion among the elect.

Judging from the context, σῴζεσθε in I Corinthians 15:2 means participation in the eschatological resurrection (or transformation, vs. 51). In II Timothy 1:9f., σώσαντος seems to mean "life and immortality". The eschatological element, though much subdued, is still present in the phrase, "until that Day" (vs. 12).

When the words, "the grace that is coming to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ", in the following verse are taken into account, I Peter 1:10-12 seems to provide an eschatological setting for the word, σωτηρίας. The "salvation of your souls" (vs. 9) is here directly associated with the death, resurrection and parousia of Jesus. The occurrence of so simple an eschatological use of this term in this late

---

1. The eschatological character of Paul's discussion here is evident in 11:15, 25f.

stratum of material indicates that, however much the eschatological hope may have varied in intensity, the form apparently remained quite constant in the _kerygma_, in some quarters at least.

Although in most instances the meaning of "salvation" is somewhat indefinite in the _kerygma_ evidence, the cases in which the context does shed some light imply that it carried the idea of deliverance from the fate of the wicked and a share in the resurrection of the righteous in the _eschaton_.

The terms, "eternal life", occurring twice, and _parousia_, occurring three times, require no comment. In three instances (Acts 10:34-43; 17:22-31; Rom. 2:16), Jesus is proclaimed as the agent of God's final judgment. Although infrequent, the presence of this idea in the _kerygma_ manifests the ethical nature of its eschatology.

Of the five instances of the "kingdom of God" (or "kingdom", Acts 20:25) in the Acts evidence, only one, 14:22, is used in such a way as to provide any further insight into the eschatology of the _kerygma_. Here the familiar notion of the pre-messianic tribulation is apparently made use of to explain the hardships through which the Christians were passing. This provides a hint of the way in which this term was used. The term itself does not occur in the _kerygma_ evidence outside of Acts, but the idea is surely present in the phrase, "we shall also reign with him". In this case the

"kingdom" is quite literal. The form of this "saying" suggests that it is probably much older than the document itself, indicating that, although it may have lost much of its vitality and become more or less formal, the idea of the "kingdom" in a literal sense was quite common in the tradition.[1]

While probably not too much should be inferred from it, Paul's use of the word "mystery" as referring to the whole advent of Jesus, including the parousia, and its character as a mystery revealed (ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου, Rom. 16:25), gives it a definite apocalyptic turn. The idea seems to be that with the revelation of the Messiah as Jesus and the occurrence of certain preliminary events in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the whole eschatological plan of God has become known. This knowledge provides an incentive for preaching the gospel to the gentiles and a basis for the appeal for their repentance and faith.

The kerygma evidence contains certain phrases that seem to refer to the pre-messianic woes, or at least to some such disastrous fate awaiting the wicked. The idea is alluded to in an incidental fashion that appears to take it for granted that it was commonly known and accepted.

In Acts 2:14-40, both the "wonders" and "signs" in the

---

1. Cf. Mt. 19:28; Lk. 22:29-30.

Joel quotation and the reference to "this crooked generation" suggest the ominous fate awaiting the unrepentant.

The term, "future judgment", in Acts 24:25 is quite likely a reference to the final punishment of the wicked. The word, κρίμα, is frequently used in the sense of executing punishment upon the guilty.[1] With the adjective μέλλοντος, it at least refers to the great assize. The phrase, "those who are perishing", in I Corinthians 1:18 alludes to the same idea.

The clearest reference to this idea of the "Coming Disaster" upon the unrepentant is in I Thessalonians 1:10 in the words, "the wrath to come".

The eschatological ideas, indicated by these terms to have been in the kerygma, appear quite conventional except in their connection with Jesus. The parousia will provide the final manifestation of God's judgment of which Jesus will be the agent. The faithful dead will be saved by being raised to eternal blessedness. The unrepentant wicked will perish. Divine portents will be seen in heaven and on earth.

The evidence for eschatology in the kerygma references is surprisingly scarce and fragmentary. It is impossible to infer any development in this respect. The ideas are expressed in such an incidental way as to suggest that their

---

1. Cf. Rom. 2:2-5; 5:16; Gal. 5:10; Heb. 6:2; I Pet. 4:17; II Pet. 2:3; Rev. 17:1.

common acceptance was taken for granted. Whether this was true of the kerygma itself or was due to the conditions under which the documents were written is impossible to say.

It is interesting to note that Dodd finds it necessary in delineating the "most significant and far-reaching developments of the apostolic preaching in the New Testament" --which are for him the modification of eschatology--to depart from the specific references to the kerygma and treat the general line of thought he finds in the Johannine and Pauline writings.[1] The time element, of course, must have created problems but so far as references to the kerygma are concerned the early Christian preachers continued to pay lip service at least to this more or less conventional pattern of eschatological ideas.

It is important to note that, judging by the comparative frequency of the items, the real concern of the kerygma was to proclaim one eschatological fact--that the Messiah is Jesus. There is no attempt here to elaborate or to alter to any degree the ideas of the eschaton. What is proclaimed is the fact that it is now known who the Messiah is. The eschatological Man has been revealed; the time for repentance and ethical preparation, therefore, has arrived, for the eschaton cannot be far away. Its coming is sure.

---

1. AP, p. 73.

The basically ethical nature of this eschatology does not by any means represent a development peculiar to Christianity. This was the character of pre-Christian apocalypticism. R. H. Charles writes:

> Now it can be shown that Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic are not opposed to each other essentially: that fundamentally they have a common basis and use for the most part the same methods: that apocalyptic no less than prophecy is radically ethical.
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . and yet an attempt has recently been made by advanced liberals to differentiate prophecy and apocalyptic on the ground that apocalyptic and ethics are distinct, and that ethics are the kernel and apocalyptic the husk, which Christianity shed when it ceased to need it. But apocalyptic was essentially ethical. To use the mixed metaphor of St. Paul, it was rooted and grounded in ethics, and that an ethics based on the essential righteousness of God. In every crisis of the world's history, when the good cause was overthrown and the wrong triumphant, its insistent demand was ever: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" and its uncompromising optimism, its unconquerable faith under the most overwhelming disasters was: "God reigns, and righteousness shall ultimately prevail."[1]

There is a hint in the words, "Repent therefore, . . . that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus" (Acts 3:20), that the coming of the eschaton is at least partly contingent upon the response of the hearers.[2] The

---

1. DNT, pp. 16, 19.

2. Cf. Mt. 23:37-39.

concern of the apostolic preacher was, following the pattern of his Master, to issue a call to repentance for the establishment of a new community of righteousness which would fulfill the conditions of God's gracious action toward man, a community in which all the blessings and hopes contained in the "Day of the Lord" would be realized. In this the early Christian preacher stood squarely in line with Israel's ancient prophetic tradition.

> And I will give portents in the heavens and on the earth, blood and fire and columns of smoke. The sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon to blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.
> And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered. Joel 2:30-32 (Acts 2:19-21).

> "Is not this the fast that I choose: to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the thongs of the yoke, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke? Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover him, and not to hide yourself from your own flesh? Then shall your light break forth like the dawn and your healing shall spring up speedily; your righteousness shall go before you, the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard. Isaiah 58:6-8.

CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions to which this study have led may now be summarized as follows:

1. The *kerygma* varied both in its character and in its development according to the needs and circumstances facing the various preachers. The formula-like recital of the death, resurrection, and the like, of Jesus was not the essence of the *kerygma*. This formula was the result of the crystallization of certain facts and claims which followed a pattern which their very nature forced upon them. This pattern was, itself, partly the result of development. When the references to the *kerygma* throughout the New Testament are taken into account, its variety and adaptability become evident and the "formula" recedes decidedly in importance.

The reconstruction of the pre-literary development of the *kerygma* must, therefore, proceed by a study of the function of the various items and categories in its argument from which their probable origin can be inferred.

2. The true origin of the *kerygma* is found in the preaching of Jesus which consisted of a call to repentance based upon the imminence of the kingdom of God. The ethical aim of this preaching is retained in the *kerygma* throughout

and comprises the perspective from which this study has proceeded. Belief and baptism were early added to the kerygma, but they only serve to augment the ethical aim.

3. The first major change resulted from the crucifixion. The appeal for repentance remained constant along with the announcement of the imminence of the eschaton. Lacking Jesus' personal presence, the apostolic preachers appealed to His Messianic role for their authority. But this appeal necessitated an answer to the problem of the crucifixion. The resurrection and/or ascension became the basic answer. The imminence of the eschaton now became more certain because Jesus was at the right hand of God in readiness for the parousia.

4. Further development took place in the elaboration of this basic line of argument. The kerygma, in essence, was an argument for repentance, faith, and a new ethical relationship to God which somehow proceeded from the claim of a Messianic role for Jesus. The argument characteristically included His death, resurrection and parousia. The concept of messianism that resulted was a combination of the Davidic messiah and the Enoch Son of Man which was made by means of the idea of the Suffering Servant (of Second Isaiah). The earthly Messiah Jesus became the transcendant Son of Man by means of His suffering and resurrection to the right hand of God.

In some quarters, probably under Pauline influence,

positive values began to be discovered in the crucifixion. By means of it, Jesus atoned for the believer's sins; He abolished death and triumphed over demonic powers; and He became an example for His persecuted followers.

In support of this line of reasoning, other arguments were brought forward. It was inevitable that almost immediately the Christian preacher would be forced to deal with the background of messianism. A system of Scriptural exegesis apparently began to develop almost from the first in which exactly that course of events through which Jesus had gone was found to be predicted of the messiah. Jesus was proclaimed to be the culmination of the providential destiny toward which all history, particularly Israel's history, had been moving.

Followers of John the Baptist were told that their leader had acknowledged Jesus as his great successor to Whom they should give heed. Those who expected the messiah to be the scion of David were referred to Jesus' Davidic lineage. To those for whom the Jewish Scriptures held no authority, the preachers announced that the God of Whom they spoke was the Creator of heaven and earth and therefore commanded their obedience. God, they said, had in the past permitted the nations to take their own way but now He was bringing to its end the mundane course of history, and the final judgment by His appointed Man (identified, in one instance, by the resurrection) would soon take place. Therefore, all men were

called to repent and turn to Him. But this did not mean they were to become members of the Jewish commonwealth.

The phenomena of the miraculous power of Jesus' Name and the ecstatic results of the gift of the Holy Spirit were pointed to as evidence of the truth of the kerygma. Forgiveness of sins was promised to the repentant.

The separation of the Christian community from the synagogue and the expansion of the gentile mission probably help to account for the development of the idea of universalism in the kerygma. The universalism of some of the prophets and apocalyptic writers, together with the cosmic nature of the eschaton, may have furthered this development.

5. The eschatology in the kerygma, insofar as it can be determined from the evidence, manifested little change, except possibly the diminution of its fervor. The main accent of this element is on the judgment of the wicked and the resurrection of the repentant to blessedness (or eternal life). In comparison with the major emphasis upon the Messiahship of Jesus, there is surprisingly little said about eschatology. What is said is expressed in more or less conventional terms and appears to take for granted a common ground of ideas on the subject.

The persistent belief of the early Christians in the Messiahship of Jesus, His crucifixion, and His resurrection, on the one hand, and the practical demands of circumstances, on the other, seem to have determined the course of the

development of the <u>kerygma</u> along these general lines as the apostolic preachers pursued their unaltered aim to bring their hearers, by repentance, faith, baptism, and forgiveness of sins, to a new ethical relationship to God. The apostolic preachers, therefore, simply carried on and developed the basic message of their Master: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel." (Mk. 1:15)

APPENDIX

The following tables show the actual count of the frequency of the items and categories occurring in the *kerygma* evidence from which the percentages in Tables I and II (pp. 74, 79) were computed.

TABLE III.
Showing Frequency of Items

ITEM	GRAND TOTAL	DIRECT	INDIRECT	ACTS	PAUL	LATER
Total number of passages	65	15	50	35	25	5
Scriptures Fulfilled	19	9	10	13	3	3
Appeal to Natural Reason	6	2	4	4	2	--
Early Hebrew History	2	2	--	2	--	--
Davidic Descent	4	2	2	2	1	1
John the Baptist	2	2	--	2	--	--
Messiahship	37	8	29	14	19	4
King	1	--	--	1	--	--
Lordship	18	7	11	11	6	1
Just One	1	1	--	1	--	--
Servant	2	1	1	2	--	--
Holy or Rightoues One	5	--	5	5	--	--
Author of Life	1	1	--	1	--	--
Son of God	6	2	4	3	3	--
Son of Man	1	1	--	1	--	--
Saviour	3	1	2	1	--	2
Likeness of God	1	--	1	--	1	--
Good Life	4	3	1	3	1	--
Crucified	25	9	17	13	10	3
Buried	4	3	1	2	2	--
Resurrected	20	10	10	13	7	1
Exalted	8	6	2	6	--	2
Followed by the Holy Spirit	8	4	4	5	2	1
Power of the Name	9	7	2	8	1	--
Forgiveness of Sins	9	7	2	7	2	--
Salvation	13	5	8	6	5	2
Eternal Life	2	1	1	1	--	1
Parousia	3	1	1	2	1	--
Jesus as Judge	3	2	1	2	1	--
Kingdom of God	6	--	6	5	--	1
Mystery	4	--	4	--	3	1
Coming Disaster	4	1	3	2	2	--
Call to Repentance	10	7	3	9	1	--
Baptism	7	3	4	6	1	--
Call to Faith	28	8	20	14	12	2
Universality of Kerygma	11	6	5	10	--	1
Command to Preach	13	7	6	7	4	2

TABLE IV.
Showing Frequency of Categories

CATEGORY	GRAND TOTAL	DIRECT	INDIRECT	ACTS	PAUL	LATER
Total number of passages	65	15	50	35	25	5
Background	27	11	16	18	5	4
Messianic Character	47	12	35	22	21	4
Life History	33	12	21	16	13	4
Effect on Believers	18	10	8	11	6	1
Eschatological Role	29	8	21	15	10	4
The Appeal	34	12	22	18	14	2
Cosmic Significance	21	10	11	14	4	3

7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baruch
The Apocalypse of Baruch (tr. with notes by R. H. Charles).
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

Cadbury, Henry J.--MLA
The Making of Luke-Acts.
New York: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

----------Art. (1933)
"The Speeches in Acts."
Foakes-Jackson, BC, Vol. V, pp. 402-27.

----------Art. (1953)
"Acts and Eschatology." (This article is to be published. The date and page numbers herein used refer to the manuscript).

Charles, R. H.--BOE
The Book of Enoch.
New York: Macmillan and Co., 1893.

----------AB
The Apocalypse of Baruch.
London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

----------DNT
Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testament.
New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1914.

Cohen, Abraham--ET
Everyman's Talmud.
London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1932.

Dibelius, Martin--FTG
From Tradition to Gospel (tr. Bertram Lee Woolf from the German of the 2nd rev. ed.).
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dodd, C. H.--PK
The Parables of the Kingdom. 3rd ed. (rev.)
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, (1935) 1936.

----------AP
The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. 2nd ed.
London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., (1937) 1944.

----------ATS
According to the Scriptures.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Drummond, James--JM
The Jewish Messiah.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.

Enoch
The Book of Enoch (tr. with notes by R. H. Charles).
New York: Macmillan and Co., 1893.

Enslin, Morton Scott--CB
Christian Beginnings.
New York: Harper and Bros., 1938.

Ezra
IV Ezra (tr. with notes by George Herbert Box).
London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake--BC
The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols.
London: Macmillan and Co., 1933.

Glasson, T. F.--Art. (1953)
"The Kerygma: Is our Version Correct?"
The Hibbert Journal, Vol. LI (Jan., 1953), pp. 129-32.

Greenstone, Julius H.--MIJ
The Messiah Idea In Jewish History.
Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948.

Hunter, A. M.--MNT
The Message of the New Testament.
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1944.

Lake, Kirsopp--Art. (1933)
"Proselytes and God-Fearers."
Foakes-Jackson, BC, Vol., pp. 74-96.

Major, H. D. A., T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright--MMJ
The Mission and Message of Jesus.
New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1938.

New, Silva--Art. (1933)
"The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands."
Foakes-Jackson, BC, Vol. V, pp. 121-40.

Oesterley, W. O. E.--EMI
The Evolution of the Messianic Idea.
London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1908.

Pfeiffer, Robert H.--NTT
History of New Testament Times.
New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.

Redlich, E. Basil--FC
Form Criticism.
London: Duckworth, 1939.

Richardson, Alan, and W. Schweitzer (eds.)--BAT
Biblical Authority for Today. (A World Council of Churches Symposium on "The Biblical Authority for the Churches' Social and Political Message for Today".)
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.

Ropes, James Hardy--TAA
The Apostolic Age.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

-----------SG
The Synoptic Gospels.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Schweitzer, Albert--PHI
Paul and His Interpreters (tr. William Montgomery from first German ed.). 3 printings.
New York: Macmillan and Co., (1912) 1951.

-----------MPA
The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle (tr. William Montgomery).
New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931.

Scott, Ernest Finlay--VNR
Varieties of New Testament Religion.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.

Sharman, Henry Burton--SOM
Son of Man and Kingdom of God.
New York: Harper and Bros., 1943.

Silver, Abba Hillel--MSI
A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel.
New York: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Singer, Isidore (ed.)--JE
The Jewish Encyclopedia. 12 vols.
New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906.

Solomon
The Odes and Psalms of Solomon (tr. with notes by J. Rendel Harris).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

Taylor, Vincent--JHS
Jesus and His Sacrifice.
London: Macmillan and Co., 1937.

Terry, Milton S.
The Sibylline Oracles.
New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1890.

Weizsäcker, Carl Von--TAA
The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church (tr. James Miller). 2 vols.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-95.

Wilder, Amos N.--Rev. (1952)
Rev. of Richardson and Schweitzer (eds.), Biblical Authority for Today (1951).
JBL, Vol. LXXI (Sept., 1952), pp. 183-84.

Wright, G. Ernest--Art. (1952)
"Wherein Lies the Unity of the Bible?"
JBR, Vol. XX (July, 1952), pp. 194-98.

BIBLES

The Holy Bible--RSV
Revised Standard Version (Containing the Old and New Testaments).
New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

Greek New Testament (ed. by Dr. Eberhard Nestle; rev. by Dr. Erwin Nestle., 16th ed.).
New York: American Bible Society, 1945.